The Madras University Historical Series—No. 2

HISTORY OF THE NAYAKS OF MADURA

HISTORY OF THE NAYAKS OF MADURA

by

R. SATHYANATHA AIYAR, M.A., L.T.,
Professor of History
Annamalai University,
Annamalai Nagar, Chidambaram.

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

1980

First Published 1924
Reprinted 1980

© University of Madras

Price Rs. 30/-

PRINTED IN INDIA
AT AVVAI ACHUKKOODAM, 17, P. V. KOIL STREET, MADRAS-13

CONTENTS

Chapter			Page
	Abbreviations	...	i
	Preface	...	iii
	Geneological List	...	v
	General Introduction	...	1
I.	Introductory	...	20
II.	Viśvanātha Nāyaka and the foundation of the Nāyakship (c. 1529-1564)	...	34
III.	Krishṇappa Nāyaka I (1564-1572)	...	48
IV.	Vīrappa Nāyaka (1572-1595)	....	55
V.	Krishṇappa Nāyaka II (1595-1601)	...	61
VI.	Muttu Krishṇappa Nāyaka (1601-1609)	...	65
VII.	Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka I (1609-c. 1623)	...	72
VIII.	Tirumala Nāyaka (c. 1623-1659)	...	81
IX.	Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka II (1659)	..	112
X.	Chokkanātha Nāyaka (1659-1682)	...	115
XI.	Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka III (1682-9)	...	144
XII.	The Regency of Mangammāḷ (1689-1706)	...	154
XIII.	Vijayaranga Chokkanātha (1706-32)	...	168
XIV.	Mīnākshi (1732-6)	...	175
XV.	General considerations on Nāyak Rule	...	178
	Appendix A—*La Mission Du Maduré III*	...	198
	Appendix B—John Lockman, *Travels of the Jesuits*	...	225
	Appendix C—John Nieuhoff, *Voyages and Travels into Brasil and East Indies*	...	248
	Appendix D—Inscriptions chronologically arranged	...	255
	Appendix E—*Maduraittala Varalāṟu*	...	288
	List of Authorities	—	298
	Index	...	301

ABBREVIATIONS

1. Bertrand — (Father J. Bertrand, *La Mission du Maduré.*)
2. Burgess —(Burgess and Natesa Sastri, *Tamil and Sanskrit Inscriptions.*)
3. *C.R.*—(*Catalogue Raisonne.*)
4. Danvers, *Report*—(F. C. Danvers, *Report on the Portuguese Records relating to the East Indies.*)
5. *E.C.*—(*Epigraphia Carnataca.*)
6. *E.I.*—(*Epigraphia Indica.*)
7. *I.A.*—(*Indian Antiquary.*)
8. *I.M.P.*—(*Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency*—Mr. V. Rangacharya's Topographical List.)
9. K.Ā.—(Kollam Āṇḍu or the Malayāḷam year.)
10. K.Y.—(Kali Yuga Era.)
11. Lockman—(J. Lockman, *Travels of the Jesuits.*)
12. *M.E.R.*—(*Madras Epigraphist's Report.*)
13. Nelson—(J.H. Nelson *The Madura Country*, Part III.)
14. Nieuhoff – (John Nieuhoff, *Voyages and Travels*, II.)
15. *O.H.MSS.*—(*Oriental Historical Manuscripts.*)
16. Orme, *Historical Fragments*—(Robert Orme, *Historical Fragments of the Mogul Empire.*)
17. Sewell—(R. Sewell, *Lists of Antiquities, Madras*)
18. *S.C.P.*—(Sewell's Collection of Copper Plates in his *Lists of Antiquities, Madras*, II).
19. S.K.A., *Sources*—(Prof S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar - *Sources of Vijayanagar History.*)
20. Ś.S.—(Śaka Samvat.)

21. *T.A.S.*—(*Travancore Archaeological Series.*)

22. Wilks—(Wilks, *History of Mysoor.*)

23. Numbers like '1 of 1900' refer to the number of the inscription and the year (of collection) of the Madras Department of Epigraphy.

N.B.—(1) All the dates given are A.D. unless otherwise specified.

(2) The following spelling is adopted to avoid old forms :—

(a) *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts* for Taylor's *Mirtanjeya Manuscripts.*

(b) *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle* for Taylor's *Pandion Chronicle.*

(c) Polegar for Polygar.

(d) Ariyanātha for Āryanātha.

PREFACE

The history of the Nāyaks of Madura is a subject which has received some attention already, and there have been a few attempts at presenting that history in a connected form. Both Nelson's Manual of the Madura country and Caldwell's History of Tinnevelly have become out of date owing to the fresh material that has been brought to bear upon the subject, chiefly by the advance made in epigraphical researches, and, to a smaller extent, by manuscript work. The latest effort of Mr. V. Rangachari in the columns of the Indian Antiquary has not used the Jesuit records which are invaluable to the history of the Madura country. A thorough and systematic exploitation of these invaluable records, and the presentation of a connected account of this important family of Vijayanagar Viceroys seemed called for. Mr. Sathyanatha Aiyar, B.A. (Hons.), who stood the first of his year in the History Honours examination of this University was awarded a University Research Studentship and was set to do this work. He set himself to acquire a knowledge of French for this purpose, and has been able to translate the relevant records so well that both the Rev. P. Carty, S J. and the Professor of French in the St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly, found very little in his translation to alter or amend by way of improvement. The following pages contain his thesis followed by a series of appendices containing the material upon which the dissertation is based, on the plan originally adopted for the Madras University Historical Series. The essay speaks for itself, and needs no commendation from me. My part of the work I have purposely limited to that of the editor. Throughout the work wherever an opinion was offered I have left it substantially as such, only modifying where it might have had the the appearance of exaggeration either by way of over-statement or underestimate. I have added a few notes, some of them long, throughout where a modification of any importance seemed called for. In this prefatory note, I wish to draw attention to a general remark on the Jesuit records on page 252 which seems to be somewhat of an over-statement. I have let it go though somewhat modified, but Mr. Sathyanatha Aiyar agrees with me that there is a slight over-statement in it and the remark may not be fully justifiable. I note the correction therefore with great pleasure here, and I am glad to know that he is in agreement with me on the matter.

I may record with pleasure here, that during the years that Sathyanatha Aiyar was working with me he was not only attentive to his own work, but was of great assistance to me in some of my own. He was able to take a sensible view in matters of discussion, and his criticisms always showed the right spirit. I must acknowledge the great interest that the Rev. P. Carty, Mr. Sathyanatha Aiyar's Professor in the St. Joseph's College, took in this work and the assistance that he rendered by lending the student one of the volumes of the Jesuit records which was not available in Madras. My thanks are also due to him for the kindness with which he and the Rev. J. Bourdot, S.J., Professor of French in the College, went through the Appendix - A, critically. Their approval of the translation gives it great authority. I record with pleasure my appreciation of the valuable assistance rendered by Mr. C. W. Stewart, now Manager of the Oxford University Press, Calcutta, in seeing the work through the Press, and by Mr. George Kenneth, the Superintendent of the Madras Diocesan Press, for the neat execution of the printings of the work.

I must in conclusion acknowledge my obligations to the Syndicate of the Madras University for their enlightened liberality in including this book in the Madras University Historical Series, on my recommendation.

S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR.

MADRAS UNIVERSITY
3rd December 1923.

GENEALOGICAL LIST

- Nāgama Nāyaka (of the Kāśyapa-gōtra)
  - Viśvanātha Nāyaka (m) Nāgamā [1] (c 1529-64)
    - Krishṇappa Nāyaka I (m) Lakshmamā [2] or Lakshmyāmbikā [3] (1564-72)
      - Vīrappa Nāyaka (m) Tirumalāmbikā [4] (1572-95)
        - Krishṇappa Nāyaka II (1595-1601)
        - Viśvappa
          - Muttu Krishṇappa Nāyaka [5] (1601-09)
            - Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka I (1609-c 1623)
            - Tirumala Nāyāka (c 1623-59)
              - Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka II (1659)
                - Chokkanātha Nāyaka (1659-82) (m) Mangammāḷ (1689-1706)
                  - Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka III (m) Muttammāḷ (1682-9)
                    - Vijayaranga Chokkanātha Nāyaka (1706-32) (m) Mīnākshi (1732-6)
                - Muttu Linga Nāyaka 1678)
            - Kumāra Muttu [6]
        - Kastūri Rangappa

[1] The Krishṇāpuram Plates of Sadāśiva

[2] The Daḷavāy Agrahāram Plates of Venkaṭa I.

[3] The Veḷḷangudi plates of Venkaṭa I.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] Son of Viśvappa, according to the Kūniyūr Plates of Venkaṭa II, the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts,* and the *Maduraittalavaralāṛu*; but the son of Viśvappa's elder brother, Krishṇappa Nāyaka II, according to the *History of the Carnataca Governors* and Nelson.

[6] The Kūniyur Plates of Venkaṭa II say that Muttu Krishṇa had two sons, Muttu Vīra and Tirumala. Other inscriptions refer only to a Kumāra Muttu Tirumala, the son of Tirumala Nāyaka. Kumāra Muttu is mentioned as the brother of Tirumala Nāyaka by the *History of the Carnataca Governors* and some *Mackenzie Manuscripts,* but not by the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts* and the *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle.*

INTRODUCTION

The history of the Nāyaks of Madura comprises the history practically of the *fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth,* and the *first third of the eighteenth centuries,* and carries the history of South India from the best days of the empire of *Vijayanagar* to the eve of the *British occupation of the Carnatic.* It might be described as, in essential particulars, a continuation of the struggle for Hindu independence in the south against the advancing tide of Muhammadan conquest which threatened its very existence at the commencement of the fourteenth century. The cause of Hindu independence, for which the last great Hoyśala, *Vīra Baḷḷāḷa,* lost his life in Trichinopoly, was finally overthrown by Chanda Sahib who drove, by a perfidious act of his, the last Nāyak Queen, Mīnākshi, to commit suicide in or about the year 1736.

The thesis that follows is an attempt to present a connected history of this viceroyalty of the empire of Vijayanagar, the farthest viceroyalty from the vulnerable frontier of the north. By turning out the Muhammadan garrison in occupation of its capital, the officers of Vīra Baḷḷāla laid the foundations of Vijayanagar, which stood as a bulwark for two and a half centuries in stemming the flowing tide of Muhammadan advance into this region of South India. There was much besides in connection with this viceroyalty which makes its history interesting in a peculiar way.

The viceroyalty of Madura happened to be the scene of European enterprise in the coast regions in founding trade centres which ultimately developed more or less into ruling powers, struggling for mastery first as auxiliaries of native powers and later each for its own particular advancement. The first European power that presented itself actively in this region of India was the Portuguese. It appeared in the double character of a commerical power, in possession of salient positions along the coast and some strips of territory, and of an organized political power behind the efforts of missionaries, particularly Jesuits, in the earlier stages of their work among the fisher-folk of the coast country of the Pāṇḍyas, The earliest organized missionary effort w[illegible] made in the territory of the Nāyaks of Madura, and their

capital, Madura, itself constituted an important missionary centre, though it shared this honour very early with Trichinopoly. The history of Madura, therefore, should be of much interest, if worked up with sufficient fulness by the systematic exploitation of available sources.

For the understanding of this history, the salient features of the history of Vijayangar as far as it came into contact with its great southern viceroyalty is a prime necessity. The Muhammadan invasions that began at the end of the thirteenth century swept over the peninsula like a hurricane, and when they ceased they left garrisons behind in salient positions, like so many nails in the coffin of Hindu independence in the south. Two of these Muhammadan cantonments in the Tamil country stand out clear. The one was placed in Madura, from which the descendants of the ancient Pāṇḍyas retired practically once for all, thus paying the penalty for the sin of inviting Muhammadan intervention in a war of succession. The other was an outpost of this, placed in Kaṇṇanūr, the old Hoyśala capital, about five miles north of the Coleroon, across the island of Śrīrangam. These were apparently regarded as of sufficient importance to justify the constitution of the province of Ma'bar as one among the twenty-three provinces that constituted the empire of Muhammad-bin-Tughluq. It was the rebellion of Muhammad's cousin, Bahau-d-Din, at Sagar that made a breach in the line of communication between the provinces of Deogir and Ma'bar. This was taken advantage of by Vīra Baḷḷāḷa, who drove a wedge, as it were, between these two provinces by establishing himself in a strong position at Tiruvaṇṇāmalai, planting at the same time several important garrison-posts in a triple line along the northern frontier. The provincial revolts that followed the rebellion of Bahau-d-Din so entangled Muhammad in a perpetual struggle to bring revolted provinces back to allegiance in the north that he hardly found time to pay any attention worth the name to the south. The Muhammadan province of Ma'bar, if it is worth being so called, was thus isolated and had to struggle for mere existence for a period of about ten years, in the course of which the struggle went through several stages. The Hoyśala monarch began a sweeping movement, sending out his armies from Trichinopoly across Pudukoṭṭa and Ramnad as far down as Rāmēśvaram. This succeeded in the main and drove the Muhammadans of Madura to make a desperate effort to save themselves. They had their reward that in the changing fortunes of war Vīra Baḷḷāḷa fell a victim to their perfidious valour. This disaster to the Hindus only deferred the doom of the Muhammadan settlement in Madura for a few years. The officers of the last two Baḷḷāḷas, who were associated with them intimately in their last struggles, carried the war to victory by persis-

tent effort. Among a number of these officers engaged in what to them was the holy cause of the Hindus, stood out a group of five brothers, whose efforts were ably seconded by a son of the third one, who is said, in the local chronicles of Madura, to have held the position of the 'door-keeper' of the last great Hoyśala, Vīra Baḷḷāḷa III. It was this prince, Kumāra Kampana, as he was called, that was responsible for the subversion of the Muhammadan dynasty of Madura, and it is this conquest that has provided the subject for the epic poem, *Madhura Vijayam*, said to have been composed by one of his wives, Gangādēvi. Inscriptions refer to the efforts made by him to introduce order into the territory recently taken over from the Muhammadans, in, or before, the year 1358, and so it may be said with justification that the acquisition of the province of Madura by the empire of the Hoyśalas marks the foundation of the empire of Vijayanagar, as much as the laying of the foundation-stone of the great fortress thirty years before this, on the banks of the Tungabhadra. The province of Madura, therefore, was one of the earliest acquisitions that transformed what was the kingdom of the Hoyśalas into the empire of Vijayanagar.

The kingdom of the Pāṇḍyas had been conquered by the Cholas and incorporated in their empire early in their career. It was the great Chola king, Rājēndra, the Gangaikoṇḍa Chola, perhaps the greatest conqueror among the members of a great dynasty, that was ultimately responsible for the extinction of Pāṇḍya independence. For a century and a half after his conquest the Pāṇḍyas were feudatory to the Cholas, who exercised their authority oftentimes by appointing viceroys over the territory, to whom the Pāṇḍya monarchs had to be subordinate. In the latter half of the thirteenth century the Chola power had so far loosened its hold on the Pāṇḍyas as to enable them to make an effort at independence. In this effort they were able to enlist the sympathies of the great Ceylon ruler, Parākrama Bāhu, on their side. This war between the Pāṇḍyas and the Ceylonese, on the one side, and the Cholas, on the other, waxed and waned till at last the Ceylonese auxiliaries were beaten back and the Pāṇḍyas reduced politically to still greater depths of degradation by the last great Chola ruler, Kulottunga III. This brought about a natural revulsion. By other shiftings of political combinations, the Pāṇḍyas were able early to turn the tables upon the Cholas, and began a glorious imperial career which lasted for very near a century. It was on the death of one of the greatest among these Pāṇḍyas that there broke out a war between brothers for the succession. At the invitation of one of them the Muhammadans entered the Pāṇḍya country, the Chola power having by that time become extinct. In the course of the struggle for Pāṇḍyan independence referred to above, a certain

number of chieftains from the Chola country seem to have been planted in various localities in the Ramnad and Madura districts to hold the Pāṇḍya power in check; one set of these chieftains, who had their territories in Mānāmadura and the country round it, had the title Māvali Vāṇādarāyars. They seem to have held on during the period of the Pāṇḍya ascendancy by changing their allegiance, and we find them early in the history of Vijayanagar in the same region. During the period of Muhammadan occupation of Madura, lasting a little more than fifty years, we do not hear of the Pāṇḍyas anywhere near Madura, and, after the Muhammadan power became extinct, they hardly show themselves under the first viceroys of Vijayanagar. So we may take it that, with the occupation of Madura by Malik Kafur some time in 1310, and notwithstanding the possible temporary turning-out of the Muhammadan garrison by the Malabar ruler, Ravi Varman Kulaśēkhara, in 1316, the Pāṇḍyas had practically lost their hold over Madura. With the first viceroys of Vijayanagar in Madura, who were generally princes of the blood, appear these Māvali Vāṇādarāyar chieftains, holding important posts around the city of Madura itself. The institution of the viceroyalty of Madura therefore began almost with the foundation of Vijayanagar, and Kumāra Kampana may well be taken to be the first viceroy, his nephew following in the same exalted office under the first emperor of Vijayanagar, Harihara II.

The next time that the viceroyalty of Madura comes into prominence is under Dēvarāya II when we hear of two brothers, known by the names Lakkana and Mādana, in charge of the whole of the Tamil country. The latter seems to have had for his charge the Tanjore country; the former held high office at head quarters, probably with the government of Madura as his province, the administration of which he carried on by deputy. At one period about 1440 he is found in the south, and is given the title Viceroy of Madura and 'Lord of the Southern Ocean'. This latter title, as a new addition, is a clear indication that the authority of the empire then came into touch with the sea, and that the overseas transactions of Madura under the great Pāṇḍyas of the thirteenth and the early fourteenth centuries had devolved upon the empire, From this high commission Lakkana was called back to headquarters, after a defeat sustained by the imperial armies at the hands of the Muhammadan Sultan of the Dakhan to reform the army and to reorganize the resources with a view to final victory. It is apparently this *Dannaik* (Daṇḍanāyaka) that is spoken of in such glowing terms by the Muhammadan traveller, Abdur Razzak, who was in Vijayanagar in 1442-3.

With the death of Dēvarāya in 1449 the empire fell into some disorder owing to the recurring hostility of the Muhammadans, aggra-

vated during a little more than a decade by the advent of a new power in alliance with them, namely, the rising power of the Gajapatis of Kalinga (Orissa). The first ruler of this dynasty comes into view some time about 1335 and had been actively exerting himself to extend his frontier along the coast. He had so far succeeded that the Nellore district had passed under him, with Udayagiri as the outermost post in the possession of the Kalinga ruler, and Kalinga raids were carried at least as far as the South Arcot district, as some of the inscriptions in the localities indicate. This difficulty of the empire in the north is reflected in the looseness of the imperial hold of the southern viceroyalty. When, in the period of the usurpation of Sāḷuva Narasinga, we hear of his general, Narasa, winning a victory against a certain Pāṇḍya, by name Mānabhūsha, the inference seems clear that the Pāṇḍyas, who had retired to Tinnevelly, made an effort either to regain their independence or increase their patrimony by taking advantage of these difficulties of the empire. The period of trouble, extending almost from 1450 to the beginning of the next century, and followed by a general revolt of the provinces under Vīra Narasimha, who came to the throne in 1505, called for drastic action and a reconstitution of the viceroyalties as soon as the external enemies were beaten back and a reorganization of the empire could be taken in hand.

Such an organization could be undertaken only under Krishṇadēva Rāya. When he came to the throne about the end of 1509, the aggressive activity of the Portuguese was well under weigh. The Muhammadan activities on the northern frontier were somewhat subdued owing to their own difficulties and dissensions within. The aggression of the Gajapati had attained its zenith and Oriyan raids had been carried as far as the Tanjore district itself. In this posture of affairs it is conceivable that the distant province of Madura had lapsed into a region of warring chieftains struggling each one to appropriate as much as he could for himself. Krishṇa went about systematically suppressing rebellions within and bringing home-provinces under complete control. He came to an understanding with the Portuguese and gave them such terms that they were kept within bounds of commercial requirements. He made a demonstration in force to impress the Muhammadans on the northern frontier and strengthen the garrisons against them. He had to make a great effort to beat the intruding Gajapati out of the territories of the empire and come to a definitive treaty with him. That done, he could undertake the reorganization of the empire itself. This reorganization was, as Krishṇa's inscriptions make clear, undertaken after the year 1520, the date of the battle of Raichūr. As soon as he returned from the great campaign against the Gajapati, he went on a tour to the south.

From this apparently he came back to headquarters and undertook the expedition to beat back the Adil Shah from his aggressive advance into the Raichūr Doab. Having cleared the Doab of Bijapur forces, he started back again on his southern tour. The period 1520-5 seems to be the period of activity in organization, and may be regarded as the period when he appointed Vīra Narasimha as viceroy of the Chola country and gave the commission to Nāgama to organize the province of Madura. It is probable that Krishṇa had an attack of serious illness, as we have a record of Achyuta, of date 1525, issued from Vijayanagar itself. This, combined with a few others in the name of his young son of about the same time, indicate a government by regency of some kind. It was, probably, then that the disorderly elements in the more distant provinces began to show themselves again. That seems the period of Nāgama's activity in the southern viceroyalty.

Nāgama seems to have been a tried officer of the usurper, Sāḷuva Narasinga, like Narasa, the father of Krishṇa, himself. In point of eminence Nāgama does not appear to have been very far behind Narasa himself in the estimation of their master. He could not have been very much his inferior in point of seniority to attain to that particular position. By his own statement, Krishṇa was not a man who would have entrusted important and troublesome governments to untried men. The appointment of Vīra Narasimha to the Chola country would indicate the appointment of a similar officer of high standing for Madura. Nāgama's administration must have been thorough-going and probably entailed considerable hardship on the petty chieftains who traced their descent from the great Pāṇḍyas of the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries and who naturally put their claims too high for the acceptance of the uncompromising viceroy. It is just possible that complaints reached headquarters in some number, and one complainant with more pretentious claims even waited upon Krishṇa in person. The only flaw in the story as given in the chronicles is that we have so far come upon no epigraphical evidence of the existence of a Chandraśēkhara Pāṇḍya in Madura or of a Vīraśēkhara in the Chola country, though neither case is impossible. The royal families of the Cholas and the Pāṇḍyas were in power till so recently that the existence of scions without power or patrimony in some number is not an impossibility. Vīra Narasimha, the viceroy of the Chola country, rebelled in the very last years of Krishṇa for some reason which we are not able to understand clearly, and fled for safety to the Travancore country. It is probable that the reasons that actuated the disobedience of two of the most powerful governors about the same time were the same. The close control that Krishṇa had always attempted to exercise over the

provincial governments must have been galling to the powerful viceroys brought up in the school of Sāḷuva Narasinga and labouring to bring the empire under a unified and systematic administration. The Chola viceroy actually set up a rebellion and fled the country in fear, while the Madura viceroy, at greater distance, set the imperial authority at defiance without going so far as setting up a rebellion and trying to hold his own against the mandate of the emperor. This seems how the breach came about, and the impatient emperor, like Henry II of England, cried out in impotent rage, was there none of his henchmen who would bring the recalcitrant viceroy to a sense of discipline. Even the romantic tale of young Viśvanātha's war against his own father would not seem, in the circumstances, unlikely.

The foundation of the Nāyakship of Madura has been given different dates, and the whole discussion in regard to the foundation of the viceroyalty is due to want of sufficient appreciation of the position of Madura under the empire to the end of the reign of Krishṇadēva Rāya. It has already been pointed out that the foundation of the viceroyalty of Madura goes back almost to the foundation of the empire itself. The actual point under discussion is not when the subordinate government of Madura was constituted as an integral part of the empire, but when the Nāyakship as a semi-independant government under a comparatively nominal overlordship of the empire, actually began. In other words, what is the actual date of the beginning of comparatively independent rule under the Nāyaks of Madura ? The two issues are different in character and certainly take very different dating. The foundation of the viceroyalty as such is at some date between 1345 and 1358, the period of break in the coins of the Sultans of Madura. According to the work of Gangādēvi above referred to, the Sultan of Madura was killed in battle by Kumāra Kampana. Inscriptions, of date equivalent to 1358, refer to the orderly administration that this prince introduced in the territories disturbed by Muhammadan occupation some time anterior to the date of the inscription. The foundation of quasi-independent rule under the Nāyaks is given the date 1558-9. If the foundation of Nāyak rule be the equivalant of the foundation of semi-independent rule, this date may well be accepted as a satisfactory date and that, perhaps, is the meaning implied by those records that try to fix a date for the foundation of the Nāyakship. That has, however, been confounded with the appointment of Viśvanātha to the Nāyakship of Madura in succession to his father. The Nāyakship of Viśvanātha must have begun some time in the last years of the reign of the great king Krishṇa of Vijayanagar, and may be ascribed to the date 1529-30 for the reasons advanced in my introduction to the *Sources of Vijayanagar History* (Madras University Historical Series, I). Nāgama's

disobedience and Vīra Narasimha's rebellion in the Chola country both were somehow connected, and while Krishṇa succeeded in bringing Nāgama to a sense of discipline, Vīra Narasimha escaped punishment by flight into the Travancore country. Almost the first act of Achyuta's reign is his own march at the head of his army against this recalcitrant viceroy. Achyuta proceeded only as far as Śrīrangam, the island in the Kaveri near Trichinopoly, and the expedition to the Tiruvaḍi country marched under his brother-in-law, Salakrāju Timmarāzu or Salakkam Tirumala, who volunteered service for this expedition. This expedition was a success; the government of the Tiruvaḍi country was reduced to subordination, and the Pānḍya in gratitude gave one of his daughters in marriage to Achyuta. This means the Pāndya king obviously and not the viceroy of Madura. Viśvanātha was apparently governor of the Pānḍya country at the time, but the magnitude of the enterprise as well as the official position of the person involved called for the superior intervention of the emperor himself or his special deputy. Viśvanātha's position must have been that of an ordinary governor of Madura, as yet unsettled owing to the various discordant elements constituting the viceroyalty at the time. There were the Pānḍyas on the one side, the Māvali chieftains on the other, and other chieftains of various degrees of influence and importance who had to be brought under a system of administration represented by the viceroyalty of Madura. Viśvanātha's time must have been occupied in devising a system that would meet the demands of his government at the time, and his resources in the circumstances could not have been equal to this enterprise. But these circumstances did not prevent the viceroy of Madura bearing his part in any special commission under the command of an imperial general. Evidence that this was the position of the viceroy will appear later. Achyuta, having settled the disturbance in the south country, made a progress through his dominions, which terminated on the banks of the Krishṇa some time in the year 1534, as a record of a grant by him, from his camp on the banks of the river, for the merit of his mother, shows. Thereafter Achyuta lapses into a kind of obscurity which may be entirely due to our want of knowledge, but seems none the less due to some extraordinary difficulties which he had to contend against. Our material for the history of the next decade is comparatively scanty, and all that can be gleaned from the only accessible sources shows a state of things in the capital which left the provincial governments to themselves. Achyuta somehow let his authority lapse, perhaps by his own default, into the hands of two of his brothers-in-law, and this remissness on his part set up against him a powerful and influential party, headed by three brothers, claiming to be sons-in-law either of Krishṇadēva Rāya himself or of his

third brother, Ranga, which seems to have had the countenance or active support of even the queens of Krishṇa. This gradually developing rebellion was complicated by one or even two Bijapur invasions, and ended in the deposition and death of Achyuta's son, Venkaṭa, who succeeded for a brief space after Achyuta's death. Sadāśiva, a nephew of Achyuta and a son of his late brother Ranga, was installed on the throne, the real authority being exercised by the three brothers. So far as the southern viceroyalty was concerned, imperial intervention was called for under peculiar stress of circumstances after the first two or three years of the new reign.

In the settlement introduced after the Travancore war, Achyuta seems to have made a rearrangement of the territories between Tanjore and Madura, appointing Chinna Chevva (Śevvappa Nāyaka), the husband of his sister-in-law, to the viceroyalty of Tanjore, which probably did not include the whole charge of Vīra Narasimha but took in some part of the territory from the viceroyalty of Madura. The reconstituted viceroyalty included probably all the present-day districts of Madura and Ramnad, and the overlordship apparently of the southern portions of the Madura district and Tinnevelly, where the descendants of the Pāṇḍyas, legitimate and illegitimate, held sway under the suzerainty of the viceroy himself. The territories of these Pāṇḍya chieftains were in touch with the Travancore country and were liable to invasions from Travancore. The coast region was open to Portuguese enterprise and the chief ports of the south contained Portuguese factories and were otherwise accessible to Portuguese commercial enterprise. This enterprise involved, in respect of the Portuguese, a certain amount of missionary enterprise as well. The advent of Francis Xavier in the southern region created a new and powerful influence, the political aspects of which have not received adequate attention among the historians of this period. The Paravas, the fisherfolk along the coast, were being rapidly converted to Christianity, and such conversion was interpreted as involving a change of allegiance of the inhabitants from their Indian rulers to the king of Portugal. This wholesale conversion of a class of industrious inhabitants of the coast, including among them those engaged in pearl-fishing, made them *ipso facto* subjects of the king of Portugal. This meant the transfer of the coast country of the south from allegiance to the empire of Vijayanagar to that of the king of Portugal by the act of a successful missionary and his companions, a position which the empire could not look on with indifference under any circumstances. Following as it did an extension of authority by the ruler of Travancore, who carried his arms successfully across the whole of the peninsula and asserted his authority even in Tuticorin, it called for drastic action on the part of the empire. These two dangers, almost

simultaneous in their incidence, called again for imperial intervention and special imperial officer had to be deputed on this commission. This was the invasion of the Tiruvaḍi country by Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala, a cousin of the three brothers who actually carried on the administration in the name of Sadāśiva. His commission was to bring the Tiruvaḍi to a sense of his own limitations and reduce the Parava coast to its normal sense of political allegiance. Xavier's complaints about the atrocities of the 'Baḍages' and his wailing against the drastic measures these 'Baḍages' took have reference to this. Rāmaraja Viṭṭhala and his younger brother, Timma, after him, seem to have exercised this superior commission and remained in the Pāṇḍya country for more than ten years. During this period the viceroy of Madura, Viśvanātha, and his son, Krishṇappa, had to be subordinate to this special officer. The viceroy bore his part loyally, and even his young son, Krishṇappa, distinguished himself in the fighting line. Viṭṭhala's commission extended perhaps even to an invasion of Ceylon, in which this young prince seems to have taken part. When at last Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala and his brother had concluded these wars and introduced an ordered administration within and secured the acknowledgment of the imperial authority among the powers outside of the frontier, they left the viceroyalty extended in its sphere both of territory and political influence to the viceroy Viśvanātha. Assumption of this higher authority by Viśvanātha, after the completion of Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala's commission in the south, marks an epoch in the history of the viceroyalty, and has probably been fastened upon by chroniclers as the date of the foundation of the viceroyalty of Madura. This is not unreasonable if regard is had to the fact that the power and prestige of the viceroyalty, as thus reconstituted, went back to the position that it occupied under another previous special commissioner, the great Daṇṇāyak, Lakkana, in the reign of Dēvarāya II.

This devolution of the viceroyalty, extended in its sphere and exalted in its privileges, upon Viśvanātha marks the foundation of the viceroyalty or Nāyakship. That is how the dating 1558—9 for this event can be accounted for. The province had certainly been organized to some extent under Viśvanātha before the arrival of these special commissioners. The latter had apparently agreed to destroy the external dangers that threatened the viceroyalty and introduce well-regulated relationship between the viceregal headquarters and the more important feudatories within the territory of the viceroyalty proper and on its borderland. It is not surprising that this work occupied a period of close upon ten years. The reformed viceroyalty, therefore, may be regarded as something quite different from the viceroyalty as held by Nāgama, and by Viśvanātha in succession to

him. The government of the viceroyalty was apparently carried on uneventfully till the epoch-making battle of Talikota, which seriously damaged the prestige of the empire and made its position in respect of the great viceroyalties behind it somewhat weaker. The transference of the headquarters from the front line at Vijayanagar to the second at Penukonḍa in itself is an expression of a certain faintness of heart in the councils of the empire. The empire went on unimpaired, however, during the reign of Tirumala, notwithstanding the fact that the imperial family, in the person of Sadāśiva, was put aside some years after the battle either by Sadāśiva's death in the course of nature or otherwise. The arrangement that Tirumala made on the eve of his death for the carrying on of the administration of the empire marks the beginning of a division which both nature and history perhaps justified at the time, but was pregnant with consequences fatal to the unity of the empire. He had three sons surviving at the time. The eldest, Śrīranga, was to succeed to the empire as a whole. Under him were to be his two younger brothers as some kind of superior viceroys, one having for his territory practically all the country above the ghats with his headquarters at Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam. This charge was given to Rāma, the second surviving son. All the country below the ghats, excepting the region immediately under the headquarters at Penukonḍa, but including within it the Tonḍa, Chola, and the Pānḍya Manḍalams together with the country of Travancore, was given to the youngest brother, Venkaṭa, who was similarly viceroy of the whole region with his headquarters at Chandragiri. This arrangement had in it certain obvious conveniences in the circumstances of the empire. The attention of the emperor would be fully taken up with providing for the defence of the northern frontier against the ever-threatening danger of Muhammadan invasions either from Golkonda or Bijapur or even the two together, as the attention of the northern states of the Bahmani kingdoms was diverted by the first beginnings of the Moghul movement in the Dakhan. Hence this arrangement of the distribution of charges was not in itself bad. The vital defect perhaps lay in the imperfect grasp by the two viceroys of the essential need of political unity. This was understood during the lifetime of Śrīranga, notwithstanding the misfortune that befell the empire in the course of his reign in the year 1579—80. In one of the many invasions of the territory of Penukonḍa by the Muhammadan armies of Golkonda, Śrīranga happened to fall a prisoner, and so remained for some time. He was set free, probably as the result of a treaty, and the empire went on for another seven or eight years during his lifetime uninjured by this calamity. When he died about 1586 his youngest brother, Venkaṭa, succeeded to the throne; Rāma, the second brother, hap

apparently predeceased his elder brother. The premonitory symptoms of the coming disruption seem to have already made themselves felt when the Madura Nāyak, Vīrappa, made an effort at independence soon after the siege of Penukoṇḍa in which Śrīranga became prisoner. Venkaṭa, with the aid of the Nāyak of Tanjore, was able to assert his authority over Madura, and thus tide over the first effort at disruption. This probably is what is referred to as the battle of Vallamprākāra in the Pudukoṭṭai plates of Śrī Vallabha and Varatunga Pāṇḍya. After Venkaṭa's accession to the throne in 1586 the same Madura viceroyaly seems to have created trouble, and Venkaṭa had to commission his young nephew to bring the recalcitrant viceroy to a sense of allegiance. Tirumala, the eldest son of Rāma, instead of doing this, his clear duty, appears to have made common cause with the rebel viceroy, and, instead of returning to the imperial headquarters, where he was for the time being as a young man, proceeded straight to his father's viceroyalty at Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam, thus marking the beginning of the disruption of the empire. Venkaṭa was able to let his nephew alone, sulking in Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam. This series of events appear to have happened in the last years of the century and the beginning of the next. This want of good-will between the nephew-viceroy and the uncle-emperor seems to have continued unabated, so much so that the emperor looked on, perhaps with satisfaction, at the extinction of the viceroyalty at Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam by the energetic exertions of a feudatory chief in the person of Rāja Uḍaiyār of Mysore, the founder of the dynasty of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore. The emperor had his own difficulties to contend against in the constant harrying invasions of Golkonda, and, at the time that Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam fell, he was actually threatened with a siege of his capital, from which he was saved by the timely exertions of the Tanjore forces under the command of the heir-apparent, Raghunātha Nāyaka. That the emperor was not dissatisfied with what had befallen his nephew is indicated in the charter he issued in 1612 confirming the acquisition of the Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam viceroyalty by Rāja Uḍaiyār. The younger brother of the ex-viceroy of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam still remained at court apparently, so that, from the point of view of the emperor, the viceroyalty passed from the hands of a recalcitrant nephew whose loyalty was doubtful to the hands of an enterprising chieftain whose future loyalty he had no reason to suspect. The separation of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam, therefore, may be regarded as the first act of dismemberment of the empire, though for another quarter of century the ruler of this province conducted himself as a loyal feudatory.

Venkaṭa dying childless in 1614, his young nephew Śrīranga, who had apparently been known before as 'Chikkarāya' (Yuvarāja or

heir-apparent), was declared, in accordance with the wishes or Venkaṭa, his suceessor in the empire. Unfortunately for the empire there was a young man brought up in the family as the son of one of the queens of Venkaṭa who came of the family of the Gobbūri chiefs. Venkaṭa and his councillors seem to have doubted the maternity, and declared the nephew, Śrīranga, emperor. The Gobbūri chief, Jagga, took up the cause of this putative son, and awaited an opportunity to massacre the whole of the royal family and thus gain for his nephew the title to the empire. He found the opportunity and succeeded in destroying Śrīranga and his children, three boys and two girls, excepting one of the boys, the middle one, as the story has it, who was smuggled away by a washerman of the royal family at the instance of a loyal chieftain, Yāchama Nāyaka. Prince Rāma having thus escaped the holocaust of the royal family, a war of succession became certain and provided the inevitable test of loyalty. Yāchama, a comparatively petty chieftain, could hardly stand against the traitor, Jagga, and his allies, and looked about for support among the great feudatories of the empire. He found he could count upon the support of the Nāyak of Tanjore and of nobody else. The Nāyak of Madura stands out in bold relief as the head of the disloyal combination against the fugitive prince and his protector, Yāchama, and, as such, against Tanjore. The Nāyak of Madura, the Nāyak of Gingi, the Pāndyas of Tinnevelly, the Portuguese, and perhaps even distant Travancore stood ranged on the side of the traitor. Mysore seems to have held aloof in this war of succession. In the description of the forces arrayed on either side of the now famous battle of Toppūr, the name of Mysore does not occur in any of the accounts. This absence of Mysore cannot be explained altogether by the possibility of Muhammadan invasions on the northern side. There was, perhaps, in it an undercurrent of disloyalty, and there may have been the excuse of an imminent Bijapur or Golkonda invasion from the north. Whatever was the reason, Mysore did not show itself on either side, while Madura stood out the champion of the traitor Jagga. We have not the means to decide whether the knowledge, that possibly Venkaṭa possessed, of the real character of the youth set up against his nominee, was common enough to be shared by the feudatories of the empire. Some of them may have honestly believed that the candidate supported by Jagga was the real claimant, but the general support that the accession of Śyīranga Chikka Rāya had and the desperate step that Jagga took to assert the claims of his nephew seem clear enough indications of the general position in regard to the respective claims of the two parties concerned. It would, therefore, be reasonable to conclude that Jagga and his friends were guilty of treason to the empire in the line of action that they adopted in regard

to the particular question. So far as the history of the Nāyaks of Madura is concerned, this gives clear evidence of the lurking desire on the part of the Nāyaks, beginning with Vīrappa I, to make themselves independent if a suitable opportunity offered itself.

Thenceforward the position of the parties becomes clear, and Madura must be counted among the feudatories whose policy towards the empire was a great deal shaped by the possibility of achieving independence. The guiding consideration had become not loyalty to the empire but the attitude of the other powerful feudatories in regard to this central question. During the reigns of Śrīanga II and his successor, Venkaṭa II, the empire managed to hold together, leaving the feudatories pretty much to their own devices to shape their policy as they liked. Hence we see the imperial power maintaining the position of an interested or disinterested spectator in all the shiftings and changes of frontiers between the greater feudatories, among them chiefly Madura and Mysore. This was due to the supreme need of the empire to make a stand against Muhammadan advance, as Bijapur had begun her advance in right earnest into the territory of the empire by coming to an understanding early with Golkonda in regard to their respective spheres of operations. Bijapur was to appropriate as much of the Carnatic above the ghats as she could, and Golkonda was to have a free hand in the portion of the empire below the Ghats. The brunt of the Bijapur aggression fell upon the empire proper at Penukoṇḍa. and subsequently at Chandragiri, and lastly at Vollore. The brunt of the Bijapur aggression fell upon Mysore and to a certain extent on Ikkēri as well. In withstanding the aggressions of Bijapur and keeping them within bounds Mysore did, to a considerable extent, render services to the empire. These services became greater as Mysore extended her borders by appropriating the bulk of the territories of the Channapaṭṭaṇa viceroyalty of Jagadēva Rāyal, which included a considerable portion of eastern Mysore and the Baramahals of Salem. Bijapur was gradually able to absorb into her territory the Mysore districts of Chittaldroog, Tumkur, and Kolar with almost one-half of Banglore. On this frontier Mysore and Bijapur stood face to face. Through all the vicissitudes of the empire Madura had no such duty to discharge either to herself or to the empire. Hence Mysore could always show herself the champion of the empire while Madura had not that excuse. When Śrīranga III ascended the throne some time about 1642, it must have seemed to him that the empire was in a very bad condition and was maintaining an unequal struggle for existence, chiefly through the want of loyalty of the feudatories of the south, particularly the powerful Nāyak of Madura. He made an organized effort to bring these Nāyaks under allegiance to him. In this move

of his he could let Mysore go on, as she had so far committed herself to no other act of disloyalty and was, by actually occupying the Channapaṭṭaṇa viceroyalty, putting herself in the way of the aggressions of Bijapur, thus rendering a service to the empire, though indirectly. The empire had to bear alone and unaided the aggressions of Golkonda. By persistent effort Golkonda was gradually overpowering the empire. The clear duty of the southern feudatories at the time was to have gone to the assistance of the empire and thus enabled it to make a stand along the second line of defence of the earlier empire. This combination, co-operating with Mysore in the policy that her own self-interest dictated, had very fair chances of success. These were thrown away by the southern viceroys, chiefly the Nāyaks of Madura, and, not content with this, Tirumala Nāyaka committed himself to inviting the intervention of Bijapur to prevent the emperor's marching against himself. It is impossible to justify this act on the part of Tirumala as the facts were too clear and too much above the surface for him not to have taken note of them. The best argument in his favour would be the possibilities of aggression from Mysore. But aggression on the part of Mysore was not possible : as it turned out, it was not possible till the agressions of Bajapur were put an end to by the active advance of the Moghuls in the Dakhan that came later but not yet. It was this want of perception of the needs of the empire and the failure to adopt an imperial policy by the Nāyak of Madura that was primarily responsible for the extinction of the empire. Mysore openly threw off the yoke in 1646, and Tirumala Nāyaka's attitude against the empire was no less open. For the next quarter of a century or more the emperor could be regarded only as a fugitive, now and then gaining the support of the loyal feudatories and exerting himself to the utmost of his power against odds which were too strong for him both within and without. The fall of the empire marked the doom of the viceroyalties without a doubt. Mysore saved herself by a timely exertion against Bijapur and by keeping the Madura Nāyaks, as far as might be, beyond her own borders.

The complicated transactions which are too indefinitely reflected in the inscriptions embodying the details of the conquest of frontier posts in the Kongu country by Chikkadēvarāja Uḍaiyār of Mysore require for a proper understanding a short retrospect of the history of the decade or fifteen years preceding. By the absorption of the viceroyalty of Channapaṭṭaṇa, Chāmarāja of Mysore had brought the Mysore frontier in touch with the northern frontier of Madura along the line of the foothills of the ghats. The rest of the present-day state of Mysore was acquired on behalf of Bajapur by the successful Bijapur invasions in the same period under Randhula Khan and his successors. After the retirement of the great general the govern-

ment of the region, which included in it the Bellary district, the Chittaldroog, Tumkur, and Kolar districts in Mysore with some outlying tracts, was entrusted to Shahji, who acted as second-in-command under Randhula Khan. The territory of the empire, which then was under Venkaṭa II, was hemmed in between the Bjiapur territories of Shahji and the conquests of Mir Jumla on behalf of Golkonda, which ultimately he transformed into a fief of his own with but nominal control from his liege-lord of Golkonda. By a marriage alliance between the two rulers, the Sultans of Bijapur and Golkonda brought about peace between themselves, and since the settlement of 1636 the Moghul danger had ceased to be imminent. When Śrīranga III came to the throne in 1642, the state of things, so far as the empire went, seemed promising enough to keep these two powers outside the frontier, if not of Penukoṇḍa or Chandragiri, at any rate of Vellore. In the years immediately following a change had taken place. Shahji had stretched out a hand to Gingi, and was able easily to occupy the fort in the interests of Bijapur to begin with, but ultimately to make it a part of his own *jaghir* In this he seems to have received the co-operation of the Nāyak of Madura. It is apparently this aggression of Shahji on behalf of Bijapur that is referred to in the Jesuit letters as an act of treason to the empire on the part of Tirumala. This advance of Bijapur was in all probability seconded by the advance of the Golkonda forces on Vellore itself, both having for their ultimate object to prevent the march of Śrīranga southwards for a successful assertion of his authority over his feudatories. Tirumala had successfully circumvented the emperor by organizing a simultaneous movement southwards of Golkonda and Bijapur. It was probably in this connection that the emperor had to double back upon Vellore, and succeeded in beating back the Golkonda invasion and in raising the siege of Vellore. In this successful enterprise of his he received efficient help from Śivappa Nāyaka of Ikkēri, who may not at the time have usurped the throne. Apparently Golkonda repeated her attacks and ultimately dislodged Śrīranga some time about 1646 : this resulted in the move of Shahji towards Gingi. It is probably this precarious position of the emperor that accounts for the assumption by about 1645 of what seems formal independence by the Mysore ruler, Kanṭhīrava Narasa. The fall of Vellore, the occupation of Gingi, and this indication of independence on the part of Mysore must have made Śrīranga's position desperate, and, failing to secure useful assistance anywhere near, he made an appeal to Shah Jahan in 1653, offiering even to become a convert to Islam if the emperor made it a condition preliminary to rendering him the assistance that would enable him to regain his territory. The appearance of Aurangzib in the Dakhan and his machinations

to take posssession both of Golkonda and of Bijapur put new heart into the emperor, who apparently made another effort to bring the Hindu rulers of the south together in supporting him to beat the two Musalman states back into their normal frontiers. In this effort probably he had the countenance of Mysore, and Tirumala Nāyaka's unpatriotic efforts against the success of this combination account in all probability for the aggravated hostility between Mysore and Madura. During the period 1652 to 1656 or 1657 the two Muhammadan states were fully occupied in their efforts to keep outside the clutches of the octopus, Aurangzib, the Moghul viceroy of the Dakhan. The chances of success of a Hindu combination were therefore at the time very good. For some reason or other the emperor got estranged from the ruler of Mysore, and, instead of a combination of all the Hindu states against the Muhammadans, the Hindu states themselves divided into two camps, and we have the spectacle of a combind attack upon Mysore of all the other Hindu powers of the south. Kanṭhīrava Narasa had to struggle against this combination and he managed to hold his own. His death and the death of Tirumala Nāyaka of Madura took place about the same time. The Muhammadan states of the Dakhan had been greatly reduced and were saved from entire destruction by the outbreak of the fratricidal war for the succession to the Moghul throne. For the next decade practically, things went on as before perhaps with much less of Musalman intervention. It was now a question of an understanding, if not a combination, between Gingee and Madura against Tanjore, and of the hostility of Mysore to Madura. The wars between the last two were carried on with a considerable amount of bitterness and with varying success. After a decade of this warfare the Mysoreans were so successful that it was only by a desperate expedient that Trichinopoly could be saved for Madura. In the course of the struggle between these two states Madura managed to overthrow Tanjore and let her be overthrown by the Mahrattas in turn, so that by the time that Mysore and Madura could, after exhausting themselves, agree to get on peacefully together, the Mahrattas had become a power in the south to reckon with. The invasion of the Carnatic by Sivaji is only the culminating event of the slow advance of the Mahrattas, where previously Bijapur invasions and occupation were feared. The last decade of the century and more, the Muhammadan states were occupied in their death-struggle against the Moghuls under Aurangzib which ended only in their extinction, and they ceased to be a power in South Indian politics.

The fortunes of Śrīranga in the meantime underwent vicissitudes which are but vaguely reflected in the varying combinations of his feudatories. It has already been pointed out that the year 1646

marks in a way the formal independence of Mysore. During the next five or six years the emperor probably tried each one of his feudatories and, ultimately failing, made that pitiable appeal to the Moghul emperor. Thereafter Mysore seems to have stood out as the aggressive growing power. Ikkēri gave the asylum, which was denied to the emperor elsewhere, for some time. His exertions were so far suceessful, and perhaps the aggressions of Mysore sufficiently provocative, as to bring about a combination of the southetn states against Mysore, the emperor being put forward as perhaps the most available element of combination among them. During the reign of Devarāja of Mysore and in the early years of the reign of Chikka-dēva Rāja this combination seems to have been kept alive, perhaps by more than one war against Mysore. Through all these Mysore came out successful. The decisive event of this succession of wars seems to be the battle of Erode, which must have taken place some time about 1672 or a little before, in which Mysore decidedly defeated the combination and was able to occupy the salient position along the Kongu frontier. That was probably the last appearance of Śrīranga, the emperor. We have records of him in the Bellary District of 1662-3, and the last record in which his name occurs is one dated 1667 in the Coimbatore District. After the battle of Erode he found asylum in Ikkēri, now under the usurper Śivappa Nāyaka; and the advance of Śivappa upon Mysore and the victories that Mysore claimed at Sakkarepaṭṭaṇa and Hassan indicate apparently the last effort on behalf of the emperor. It may be this war in which, according to the *Rāmarājavijayamu*, Kōdaṇḍarāma, another scion of the Vijayanagar family and a descendant of Ramarāja of Talikota fame, claims to have defeated the Mysore general, the famous Daḷavāy Kumāraiya of this period of Mysore history. We do not hear any more about Śrīranga. His death may have had something to do with the coronation of Sivaji; bus the latter's march into the south and his attempt at an assertion of his authority over the Carnatic for which he tried so hard in 1677, must have had at the back of it the idea that he took the place of the late emperor of Vijayanagar. The issue of a coinage on the model of Vijayanagar by Sivaji is a clear indication of this. It is just possible that, as a counter-blast to this, Aurangzib tried to assert his authority over this same region by sending his slippers on elephant-back in procession. The story of this peaceful mission is related in connection with the rule af Muttu Vīrappa III. This is ascribed to a period following closely upon the fall of Bijapur and Golkonda, and may be regarded as a characteristic attempt at the assertion of imperial authority in the distant south, as much as Sivaji's effort before. The death of Śrīranga and the cessation of the empire may be dated before 1677

and after 1675, though the names of emperors figure in records till very near 1710; and thereafter the history of South India is a history of the struggle between the viceroys of the empire, such of them as survived, complicated by the presence of the Mahrattas and the advance of the Moghul generals. These latter, in the course of the next fifty years, were able to make themselves masters of Trichinopoly and put an end to the Madura viceroyalty. With that ends the history of the Nāyaks of Madura, and the only other power of importance from out of the Vijayanagar empire is the state of Mysore, which saved itself from any Moghul conquest under Aurangzib by a timely embassy which apparently Madura did not send. Mysore was allowed to pursue her career unhampered by the Moghuls, and the dynasty that made itself conspicuous in this period continues to rule to-day.

S. K. A.

History of the Nayaks of Madura

Chapter I

INTRODUCTORY

The history of the Nāyaks of Madura, which comprises roughly a period of about two hundred years, from the second quarter of the sixteenth century down to nearly the second half of the eighteenth century, was first presented as a consecutive history by Mr. J. H. Nelson of the Madras Civil Service in 1868, in his work *The Madura Country*. He has made a careful study of the various chronicles in Tamil and Telugu, and the inscriptions of the country so far collected and deciphered. Further than this, he has incorporated in his work almost all the relevant information with regard to his subject, gleaned from the administrative reports of the Jesuit missionary settlers in Madura, Trichinopoly, and other places in the south, though his work in this respect leaves much to be desired in regard to the manner in which he has utilized these records for historical purpose.

Nelson himself admits his difficulties in the way of access to reliable sources in some cases, and his inability to elucidate these sources with sufficient fulness in the midst of his multifarious public duties, some of which were inconsistent with the requirements of historical work. He foresees the need for revision of his work and a reconsideration of his views. Apart from the accumulation of materials, epigraphical and literary, more especially the former, during the fifty years since its publication, his work bears marks of having suffered much from hasty compilation. His somewhat too exclusive reliance on Jesuit testimony has to be modified by an impartial consideration and collation of all accessible sources. All the recent work of scholars, from 1900 onwards, on the history of the Vijayanagar empire, he could not have had the benefit of, and hence he could not attain to the proper perspective for the early history of this period. In spite of these defects, some at least certainly unavoidable, his work deserves praise as a creditable pioneer attempt at historical construction.

The second attempt in this direction has been made by Mr. V. Rangachari, M.A., L.T., of the Madras Department of Education, in the *Indian Antiquary* (1914—17). He has drawn upon almost all the principal original sources, with the exception of the Jesuit letters, for the information contained in which he relies solely on Nelson. Some casual references of a very important character in books not easily accessible are lost sight of, perhaps without serious detriment to his work from this point of view. It is only to be regretted that this work has not been noticed critically and in detail till now.

Mr. Rangachari's introduction to his work is on the stupendous scale of Macaulay, and begins from 1310 — a little before the Muhammadan conquest of Madura. He deals at length with the Muhammadan and Vijayanagar conquests, and the reigns of the Vijayanagar emperors, Krishnadeva Rāya and Achyuta Rāya, which are not, strictly speaking, germane to the subject in hand. The general arrangement of the matter presented is defective in parts. Questions connected with Nāyak finance are discussed immediately after the beginning of Nāyak rule under Viśvanātha. Even Nelson, who deals with this question under Tirumala Nāyaka, is not free from this charge, as he endorses the opinions of the Jesuits about the oppressive land-system of the Nāyaks, though such remarks can properly be made applicable only to the period coming after Tirumala's reign. Mr. Rangachari's reflections on the general characteristics of Nāyak rule come quite at the beginning, even before the work of the first Nāyak ruler is explained. General inferences find their proper place towards the close, at least after the facts on which they are based are stated. Though the chronology of the *History of the Carnataca Governers* is obviously too early by a century in the beginning, it is referred to at the commencement of almost every reign. Selection of the right kind of sources is an indispensable preliminary. The author constantly refers to the curious views of Manucci, Wheeler (whom he calls 'a historian with more imagination than capacity'), and others of the kind, only to condemn them as absurd. Detailed consideration of facts and views, which do not come up to a minimum standard of veracity, is wasteful. Proper canons of historical criticism are brushed aside in Mr. Rangachari's stigmatizing Tirumala Nāyaka's negotiations with the Muhammadans as 'unpatriotic'. Historical characters must be judged according to the prevailing ideas of their times. Moreover, ethical consideration of historical facts is not history. The telling remark[1] of Ch. V. Langlois and Ch. Seignobos is worth remembering, at least as a check against an excess of moral disquisi-

[1] *Introduction to the Study of History*, p.xii.

tions : 'It is not an historian's question, for instance, whether Napoleon was right or wrong in his conduct at Jaffa, or Nelson in his behaviour at Naples...all that the historian has to do is to get what conclusion he can out of the conflict of evidence' with regard to facts. The chief characteristic of Mr. Rangachari's work is the encyclopaedic variety of references given, even irrespective of their merit or relevancy. Some of the important referencces have not been made with proper care—perhaps partly due to insufficient proof-reading—and they must be verified before they are accepted. The monotony of verbiage is frequently followed by unduly long quotations and unnecessary extracts *in extenso*. Fulsome admiration and scathing condemnation constitute, perhaps, the variety of character-study and estimate of achievements. There is too much of 'cock-sureness' in such expressions as 'the question will perhaps be never solved',[2] and in frequent and unqualified use of such labels as 'wrong', 'absurd', 'ridiculous', and others to numerous to mention. There is much evidence of a censorial vein and want of taste in some of his remarks. It is hardly the work of the historian to record everything thought and said about a matter. To accumulate facts is for easier than to weigh them and estimate them at their real value. It is the function of properly using facts rather than of accumulating them that distinguishes the historian from the antiquarian. Hence it is that Lord Acton has called for 'solidity of criticism' in preference to 'plenitude of erudition' in the study of history. Discrimination in the choice of materials and constructive thinking are essential functions which a historian can never abdicate. In spite of the caution given by the Rev. William Taylor, the chronicles are taken too often at their face value, and the whole work has the appearance of a romance, as regards both matter and style. This is only in conformity with his own dictum[3] that History, and frequently Indian History, merges into romance.[4]

Some essays and occasional notes of varying lengh on this subject, or parts thereof, owe their existence perhaps chiefly to an effort at popularizing Nelson's work, and cannot, therefore, be regarded as contributions to historical research.

[2] *I.A.*, 1914, p. 260.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1917, p. 58.

[4] This criticism of Mr. Rangachari's work is allowed to pass for the following considerations:—Mr. Rangachari's is an elaborate work on the subject and challenges criticism by those that take up the subject for further research. The criticism above has nothing personal in it, and applies only to the published work. Almost the same opinion of the work was expressed by Mr. R. Sewell the historian of Vijayanagar, in a letter he wrote to me some time back. A review of the work at the beginning renders it superfluous to make the constant references which otherwise would be inevitable and, in a case like this, undesirable.—*Ed.*

Sources.—The principal sources for the history of the Madura Nāyakship are native chronicles and memoirs, which are a growth of later times. Though they have not the value of contemporary evidence, they can be taken to reflect genuine local tradition. They were apparently compiled with reference to the then existing records. Thus they are at best second-hand evidence, probably too remote to interfere with proper historical estimate, though sometimes they descend to the level of bazzar gossip. Col. Mackenzie whose object at first was merely to collect them, could not have exercised sufficient discriminative judgement in recording the statements and notices he received, and he was not spared to deal with them critically. Though some of them cannot stand even strict internal criticism, their usefulness in investing history with real flesh and blood cannot be overlooked; but they must be utilized with much caution. Bishop Caldwell's sweeping condemnation, that they 'fall beneath the level even of tradition' and are 'little better than pure inventions', has to be modified to a great extent.[5] An impartial and collated study of these native records is the only substantial basis for the reconstruction of this history. The following remarks of Rosebery describe our position more or less correctly: 'If one wishes to study seriously the life of Napoleon at St. Helena, it is necessary first to feel one's way through the maze of legendary literature to arrive at any chance or possibility of facts; it is necessary to discard copiously, until at last one may doubt if anything be left. The more one reads and sifts, the more dubious become all these chronicles, the more questionable becomes every assertion in them.'[6] Though very difficult to utilize, the native records must first be exploited for our purpose. They are of special use, and probably almost the sole source of information, for the sixteenth century.

Most of these chronicles were collected, translated and carefully edited by William Taylor in 1835 in his two volumes of the *Oriental Historical Manuscripts.* His translation does not take into consideration finer shades of meaning, and must, therefore, be frequently compared with the original. His *Catalogue Raisonne of Oriental Manuscripts,* in three volumes published in 1857, 1860 and 1862 respectively, contains abstracts of native documents which supply a volume of varied information. The value of these records must be individually appraised by searching internal and external criticism. The *History of the Carnataca Governors* gives some brief, but useful and reliable information in spite of its strange and misleading chronology. Its genea-

[5] *History of Tinnevelly*, p. 55.
[6] *Napoleon, The Last Phase,* pp. 7-8.

logical list is fuller than, and is not opposed to, that of the other chronicles. The *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts* and the *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle* are much better in point of choronology ; a better version of the latter[7] is now available than the one made use of by Taylor. Other native manuscripts supply us with a great deal of more or less valuable information though their chronological value is practically little. The *Tanjavūri Āndhra Rājula Charitra,*[8] similar. in the main, to the *Tanjāvūri Vāri Charitra* of Taylor, is an illuminating record, which bears specially on the history of Tanjore in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but also throws much light on Madura affairs, principally on the foundation of the Nāyakship. The *Singhala dvipa catha* has a very strong air of reality about it though it is unique in its contents. Besides these there are numerous Polegar memoirs, which throw a flood of light in unexpected nooks and corners.

There are some literary works in Sanskrit, like the *Sāhityaratnākaram, Rukminīpariṇayam,* and others which, though concerned primarily with the Tanjore Nāyaks, indirectly throw some light on Madura history. These works have the merit of being almost contemporary, written by cultured men who had free access to all necessary information. Numerous other works in Sanskrit and Telugu, which deal with the Vijayanagar empire and its rulers, contain many references to the course of events in Madura, which was largely influenced by this empire and its tradiations even after it had practically ceased to be controlled by it. For the period anterior to Tirumala Nāyaka, we can speak of almost common sources for both, as during this period Madura was a tributary of Vijayanagar. A sound knowledge of the history of this great empire is an essential pre-requisite for any historical work bearing on the Nāyaks of Madura.

A particular branch of the literary sources—or rather epistolary sources—is the series of annual reports to Europe by the *Jesuit missionaries* of South India on the administration of their various ecclesiastical centres. These reports or letters, originally written in Italian, Portuguese, and Latin, were translated into French by Father J. Bertrand of the Society of Jesus, and embodied in his *La Mission du Maduré,*[9] in four volumes published in Paris in 1847, 1848, 1850, and 1854 respectively. The first volume is merely introductory and gives

7 *Maduraittalavaralāṛu,* the prose introduction to the *Tiruppaṇimālai,* Śen Tamil Publication, No.27 : a translation of this is appended. See Appendix E.

8 S.K.A., *Sources,* p. 319, *seq.*

9 Some of the important letters bearing on political history have been translated by me into English and given in Appendix A. Scattered references are also rendered into English and introduced in their proper places.

general views on India and on the Christian missions; the other volumes contain the letters and certain documents connected with them. As coming from educated men of high qualifications who lived in this country and with the people, these writings are of great value. They throw much light on the religious, social, economic, and political conditions of South India in the seventeenth and a part of the eighteenth centuries. Though their object was mainly and professedly religious,[10] passing remarks on other aspects of society could not be avoided. Consequently, even the historian of political events will gain considerable material for history if he dive deep into these documents and collect these incidental references. In a way they serve as a necessary corrective to the Indian tradition as embodied in the *Mackenzie Manuscripts*. From 1659 to 1686 they contain a brief sketch of the political condition of the country, apart from casual notices of it in narrating the progress of missionary activities. The history of the reigns of Tirumala Nāyaka and his two immediate successors, at least from 1656 to 1682, could hardly be written with sufficient fulness but for these records.

The following observations of J. Lockman give a fair estimate of the value of Jesuit testimony. 'No men are better qualified to describe nations and countries than the Jesuits. Their education; their extensive learning; the pains they take to acquire the languages of the several regions they visit; the opportunities they have, by their skill in the arts and sciences, as well as by their insinuating address, to glide into courts where access is often denied to all but themselves; their familiarity with the inhabitants; their mixing with, and often very long abode among, them; these must give our Jesuits a much more perfect insight into the genius and character of a nation than others who visit coasts only and that merely upon account of traffic or from other lucrative motives......Upon the whole, therefore, the Jesuits, to speak in general, have the best opportunity of furnishing us with valuable accounts of many far-distant countries. Prabably the only circumstance which restrains the pens of most of them is their profession and certain private views.'[11] Father Bertrand remarks that the chief merit of these Jesuit letters consists in their having been written 'without any thought of publication' by men who, 'by duty and intimacy of confidential correspondence, offer, to their superiors or fellow-members, a faithful picture of their work and success, without any motive of exaggerating the colour.'[12] But this merit seems to be of doubtful historical value. The necessity of

[10] Bertrand, iii, 273. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 6.
[11] *Travels of the Jesuits*, i, Preface, pp. viii-ix.
[12] ii. pp. v-vi.

justifying their existence and enhancing the importance of their labours might well have led them, consciously or unconsciously, into exaggerations and misstatements. Further, it does not redound much to the veracity of an historical document that it was 'written under the impression of the moment and inspired by the heart'.[13] But in cases where their evidence is of doubtful value, it is not impossible, by a careful consideration of the circumstances, to disentangle truth from its misrepresentation or distortion. Hence a critical, annotated English edition of *La Mission du Madurē* by a scholar well acquainted with the history of South India in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in all its various aspects, is a *desideratum*, the importance and urgency of which can hardly be over-estimated.

The accounts given by foreign travellers, and the records of their travels and observations, though necessarily superficial and sometimes even superfluous, have generally an originality and freshness about them. The most obvious facts about, and features of, local institutions might naturally have been overlooked by native chroniclers. This gap can be filled only by contemporary foreign observers. A foreign colour may be given to, and strange ideas read into, transactions and events, which even the most careless native would not make a mistake about. But, in the absence of reliable evidence, the best use will have to be made of the distorted version. Even making allowance for all these natural, and, to some extent, irremediable defects, a foreigner's account can smooth the angularities of native prejudice and vanity. These general merits and defects appear, in a larger or smaller degree, according to the ability, culture, and special circumstances of the individual foreigner. In the present case, the accounts of Barradas and Nuniz, the observation of John Nieuhoff and others, the casual references of Thevenot and Manucci, and the notices contained in Purchas' *Pilgrimes* shed welcome sidelights on many facts and events. There are stray references to seventeenth and eighteenth century Madura in the works of Muhammadan historians and travellers. The records of Fort St. George are worth ransacking, as at times we come across unexpected notices of events.

Epigraphy is an indispensable aid to history. Generally its evidence is contemporary and precise, and contains much less of the personal element than is contained in other sources. But much caution has to be exercised in dealing with the materials it affords. Allowance has to be made for royal and governmental rodomontade, and spurious or forged plates have to be guarded against. Though

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

used with the greatest discrimination, this source can only furnish very general and meagre information as genealogical lists, chronological details, and disconnected facts. Inscriptions *per se* cannot claim any invariable superiority over the literary sources ; they are a necessary and useful supplement to them. They can only give us dry bones of history ; it is the function of literary accounts to make them real and living. Nelson had only a handful of *śāsanams* and other epigraphical records, but our position now is much better, though there is, as yet, no risk of superfluity. Almost all the epigraphical information now available for our period is collected in Sewell's *Lists of Antiquities, Madras*, the annual reports of the Madras Department of Epigraphy, the *Travancore Archeological Series*, Burgess and Natesa Sastri's *Tamil and Sanskrit Inscriptions*, and other minor publications.

The archaeological remains of the Nāyak rule are found chiefly in the districts of Madura, Tinnevelly, Ramnad, and Trichinopoly. The town of Madura and its environs especially supply us with much of antiquarian interest. The public buildings have their own story to tell. The numerous place-names bear the impress of Nāyak associations. A good local knowledge of the southern districts is a great help to the elucidation of old records.

Besides these original sources, very reliable second-hand information is avilable in the works of Robert Orme and F. C. Danvers. All these materials enable us to give a connected account of the Nāyak regime, though much has still to be left to future historical research. It has not been possible in this work to utilize historical information that may be found in Telugu Literature beyond what is contained in Professor S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar's *Sources of Vijayanagar History*.

Date of the Foundation of the Nāyakship.—Tradition is almost unanimous in ascribing the foundation of Nāyak rule in Madura to Viśvanātha Nāyaka, the son of Nāgama Nāyaka of the Kāśyapagōtra. Inscriptions also lend their support to this view The Daḷavāy Agrahāram Plates of Venkaṭa I say that Vīrabhūpa (Vīrappa Nāyaka) was born in the family of Viśvanātha Nāyaka. The Kūniyūr Plates of Venkaṭa II, which trace the ancestry of Tirumala Nāyaka, begin with Viśvanātha. The latter's name is found tacked on the names of many of the Nāyaks in their inscriptions. Chokkanātha almost invariably appears as Viśvanātha-Chokkanātha.

But the date of the commencement of Viśvanātha Nāyaka's viceroyalty of Madura and its duration are differently given in the

native chronicles ; and there is not, as yet, a consensus of opinion among scholars on this important question. The theory of Nelson, borrowed by R. Sewell and accepted by Rao Bahadur H. Krishna Sastri,[14] now Epigraphist to the Government of India, places Viśvanātha's assumption of power in 1559. This view seems to be partly the result of reliance on later tradition as embodied in the *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle* and *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts*, either of which, it seems, Nelson[15] is disposed to call 'the most trustworthy of the manuscripts translated by Taylor'. The latter chronicle refers only to the date of the crowning of Viśvanātha, not to his accession to power. It is clear from the account it gives that he was anointed after much of his work in Madura was done. Perhaps Nelson was also led away by the fact that there were no inscriptions of Viśvanātha prior to 1560, at the time he wrote. He does not discuss the question fully, but satisfies himself with the assurance that '1559 is the correct date of Viśvanāntha's assumption of government'......'the accuracy of which there *can* be no reason to doubt'.

Mr. Rangachari has attempted to discuss this question, but with no better result. He stops short with the dogmatic assertion that 'inscriptions unmistakably prove that it was 1559'.[16] He seems to rely on a misreading of the title 'Pāṇḍyakulasthāpanāchārya' in the Krishṇāpuram Plates of Sadāśiva (1567) as referring to Nāgama Nāyaka, to establish the fact that the latter was one of the principal commanders of Vijayanagar in Achyuta Rāya's Travancore campaign of 1532-3.[17] Therefore, he argues that Nāgama could not have revolted before 1535, Nor could he have done so, he continues, during the period 1535-57, when Viśvanātha and Viṭṭhala were Vijayangar viceroys in the south ; for the former was his son and the latter his relative. 'If Nāgama Nāik's revolt had taken place during the administration of these viceroys, it would certainly have been recorded in some at least of the inscriptions of the day.' Hence Mr. Rangachari's conclusion that 'Nāgama's defection must have taken place in 1557 or 1558, and that his defeat and his son's elevation must have been accomplished in 1559.'[18] He himself seems to contradict this view when he says, in another connection, that 'it is possible, nay probable, that he (Nāgama) died earlier (than 1558).'[19] Further, his argument from silence, viz., the absence of inscriptions of Nāgama's revolt between 1535 and 1557, is fallacious, and must apply equally well to the

14 *Archaeological Survey of India, Report,* 1911-12, p. 194.
15 p. 87.
16 *I.A.*, 1914, p. 258.
17 *Ibid.*, p. 191.
18 *Ibid.*, p. 260.
19 *Ibid.*, p. 15.

time he ascribes to it. His revolt is recorded in no inscription. With regard to the title attributed to Nāgama to prove his loyalty in 1532-3, it does not refer to him but to his grandson, Krishṇappa Nāyaka, as is evident from the following verses from the Krishṇāpuram Plates of Sadāśiva.[20]

'Yaśasvinā Pāṇḍyakulasthāpanāchāryakīrtinā
Mānōna (nyēna) dakshiṇamahāsamudrādhīśvarēṇacha
Nāgamakshmāpapautrēṇa Naḷanābhāgakīrtinā.'

If Nāgama had been a commander of Achyuta, it is likely to have been recorded, if not in inscriptions, at least in the *Achyutarāyābhyudayam*, which deals directly with the latter's Travancore campaign. However, Mr. Rangachari remarks: 'It is curious that Mr. Krishna Sastri totally ignores Nāgama's part in this campaign.'[21]

Taylor himself, on a reconsideration of this question, was for placing Nāgama's revolt about twently years earlier, i.e. about 1538[22]; but his object was to allow some interval between that event and Viśvanātha's assumption of authority. Wilks[23] dates the foundation of the Nāyakship of Madura in 1532. Caldwell advanced a strong plea for revision of Nelson's date and suggested 1520.[24] Thus long ago the necessity for correcting this dating, i.e. 1559, was strongly felt by scholars. The crux of the question of the foundation of the Nāyakship is in the revolt of Nāgama Nāyaka against the orders of the Vijayanagar emperor; for his revolt and Viśvanātha's viceroyalty are too closely associated in tradition to be doubted, at least in the present state of our epigraphical and historical knowledge.

Tha untenability of the date 1557-8 for Nāgama's defiance of imperial authority is clear from a careful study of inscriptions and other sources of information. He is mentioned in an inscription, dated 1484,[25] as the 'foremost servant' of the Vijayanagar emperor, Sāḷuva Narasinga I. If at least a life of thirty or thirty-five years is allowed for one to reach such a high position, Nāgama would be nearly 110 years old at the time ascribed for his revolt. The identity of the Nāgama of this inscription with the Nāgama of the Madura chronicles, the father of Viśvanāntha, is 'not unlikely' in Mr. Krishna Sastri's opinion, which is endorsed by Mr. Rangachari. Further,

20 *E. I.*, ix, p. 336, ll. 115-6; Appendix D, No. 61.
21 *I.A.*, 1914, p. 191 *n*.
22 *O. H. MSS.*, ii, p. 88.
23 I, p. 34.
24 *History of Tinnevelly*, p. 55.
25 Appendix D, No. 4.

there is sufficient evidence to show that Śevvappa Nāyaka was established in Tanjore at least by 1549[26]. This event may have been even earlier. since Achyuta Rāya must have died about 1541, and he is said to have given Tanjore as dowry to his sister-in-law, Mūtimāmbāḷ, whom Śevvappa married[27]. Since Nāgama's revolt was posterior to, and indirectly the result of, the aggressions of a king of Tanjore against a Pāṇḍya king, such a course of events could not be ascribed, in any case, to a period later than 1549, as already indicated. Further, Nāgama could not have revolted in the reign of Achyuta Rāya. As has been shown before, there appears to be no support, either epigraphical or literary, for the view that he was an officer of the latter in the conduct of the Travancore campaign. From the chronicles it is clear that he was a distinguished officer (viceroy or general revenue officer) with the control of the whole south under him and entrusted with large responsibilities before his revolt. Such an exalted office was held, under Achyuta Rāya, by Salakarāju Timmarāzu. and afterwards by Viṭṭhala. Hence Nāgama's revolt must be ascribed to a period earlier than the commencement of Achyuta Rāya's reign, i.e. to the reign of Krishṇadēva Rāya.

Caldwell's dating (1520) seems to be a little too early. After the victory of Raichur, Krishṇadēva Rāya was at ease for some time. He seems to have been perfectly free from troubles till about 1525. His last years were by no means a period of tranquillity, as is evident from the account of Nuniz and some epigraphical records. This Portuguese chronicler says[28] that the king's health was a source of anxiety to him and that he even abdicated in favour of his son, who was about six years old. The latter soon died, and the king believed that he was poisoned by his minister. In the same period, troubles were created by a responsible and powerful officer of the king, Vīra Narasimha, the governor of the Chola country, as is known from the *Achyutarāyābhyudayam*[29] and his inscriptions, the last of which belongs to 1528. Perhaps Nāgama's resolution to disobey the king was partly influenced by the attitude of this governor and by the state of affairs in the capital. Thus the last few years of Krishṇadēva Rāya's reign indicate a time when Nāgama's rebellion might well have taken place.

Our whole position with regard to the date of the foundation of the Nāyakship of Madura is strengthened by the clear and straight-

26 His inscription dated 1549; *vide* T.S. Kuppuswami Sastri : *A Short History of the Tanjore Nāyak Princes*, p. 4.

27 *Ibid.*, p. 3; *Tanjāvūri Vāri Charitra*—Taylor, *C.R.*, iii. p. 176.

28 R. Sewell, *A Forgotten Empire*, pp. 356-60.

29 S.K.A., *Sources*, pp. 158 and 162.

forward account given in the *Tanjāvūri Āndhra Rājula Charitra.*[30] The Chola aggression against the Pāṇḍya, the latter's appeal to the Rāya, Nāgama's deputation to settle the troubles, his usurpation, Viśvanātha's successful action against him, finally Nāgama's pardon, and later on Viśvanātha's appointment as viceroy of Madura are placed in the reign of Krishṇadēva Rāya. It is said that the Rāya died some time after Viśvanāntha had exercised his new authority for the improvement of the kingdom. The facts contained in this account, which are capable of verification, are so singularly correct that the whole narrative compels conviction as a faithful description of the transactions.

All that we know of Viśvanātha Nāyaka from inscriptions, chronicles, and other sources further confirms our contention that the Nāyakship of Madura under him was an accomplished fact before the death of Krishṇadēva Rāya in 1530. There are inscriptions from which his position as ruler of Madura becomes clear. No. 14 of Appendix A, 1906, dated 1598,[31] and the Veḷḷanguḍi Plates of Venkaṭa I of the same year[32] mention the defeat of the Tiruvaḍi, the Pāṇḍya king, and other kings or chiefs, and the annexation of their dominions as the achievements of Viśvanātha; and speak of his acquiring sovereignty over Madhura-*rājya* by his own prowess. This information is indirectly confirmed by the Krishṇāpuram Plates of Sadāśiva. No. 17 of 1912,[33] dated Krōdhana (1565), says that he acquired the Tiruvaḍi-*dēśa* as *amaranāyakam* (military fief) from Rāmarāja Aiyan. From all these it is evident that such a control over Travancore he could not have had without authority in Madura. The events referred to above came out of Achyuta Rāya's Tranvancore campaign, which seems to have been undertaken to remove the distrubances following in the train of the establishment of the Nāyakship of Madura. We have no evidence to believe that Viśvanātha accompanied the Vijayanagar army from the capital, and this leads to the inference that he was already in Madura. His co-operation with Achyuta's generals in this campaign is reflected in 113 of 1908, dated 1535,[34] which records the gift of a village by Achyuta for the merit of Viśvanātha Nāyaka, who is spoken of as his agent.

A careful study of the chronicles reveals the fact that Viśvanātha's elevation to the viceroyalty happened not long after his distin-

30 *Ibid.*, p. 319 *et seq.*
31 Appendix D, No. 97.
32 Appendix D, No. 96.
33 *Ibid.*, No. 56.
34 *Ibid.*, No. 14.

guishing himself in the northern campaigns of the sovereign of Vijayanagar, and that it was due to the same king, whom he had served so well in the north. If we read the accounts of Barradas and Nuniz together, it is sufficiently clear that Viśvanātha took part in the Raichur campaign of Krishṇadēva Rāya. The latter authority says that 'the page who served the King with betel had fifteen thousand foot and two hundred horse, but he had no elephants';[35] the former speaks of 'the great Naique of Madura—a page of the betel to the King of Bisnaga'.[36] This 'page of the betel', who is said to have taken part in the above-mentioned campaign, must be either Nāgama Nāyaka or, better, his son Viśvanātha. The former was too great and too old to go on active service at the time ; the latter, being then young and handsome, might well have served the king in that capacity in lieu of the father. The *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts* say that Viśvanātha used to accompany the king in his hunt when he was sixteen years of age. The *History of the Carnataca Governers* records that he was sent by him to subdue some inferior princes in the north. The extravagant claim made by the former chronicle that he subdued 'the Anga, Vanga, Calinga, Cashmira, and Nepala countries' may be understood as an exaggeration of his share in the king's campaigns in Orissa and other places. There was scope for these achievements only in the reign of Krishṇadēva Rāya. The concurrent testimony of all the available evidence goes to prove that Viśvanātha played a prominent part in Krishṇa's campaigns against the king of Orissa and the Muhammadans, and that it was to him he owed his viceroyalty of Madura.

The question of the duration of his viceroyalty throws some light on its commencement. According to the *Pānḍyan chronicle*, it was about two years and four months. This period is evidently too short for the conquest and settlement of the country attributed to him. The *History of the Carnataca Governors* says that he ruled for twenty-six years after the organization of the Pāḷaiyam system. The *Supplementary Manuscript* gives a total duration of twenty-six years; the *Maduraittalavaralāṛu*, about twentytwo years and a half in all, making him viceroy in three different periods. From the account of Rāmabhadra Nāyaka of Periyakuḷam[37] it is clear that Viśvanātha lived for more than twenty years after the reduction of the Kambam country and the erection of seventy-two bastions to the Madura fort. These considerations show the utter futility of clinging to the theory of Nelson and his followers. Almost all the chronicles speak of

35 R. Sewell, *A Forgotten Empire*, p. 327.
36 *Ibid.*, p. 230.
37 Taylor, *L, C. R.*, iii, pp. 376-8.

Viśvanātha's rule between 1535 and 1544 (nine years) as his first viceroyalty, and again refer to his holding the same authority in 1545-6 for about one year. Mr. Rangachari accepts this position, but does not explain the interval. Was Viśvanātha superseded or deputed elsewhere? The only probable explanation is that he was all along ruler of Madura, from the time of his appointment by Krishṇadēva Rāya. The nature of the times, and consequently the work he had to do, perhaps required his absence from Madura; and most probably the local chroniclers have put down his deputies as viceroys. Such an arrangement was prevalent in other parts of the Vijayanagar empire. To casual observers, the local rulers, for the time being, might appear to be real governors or viceroys. Viśvanātha's viceroyalty seems to have been continuous, though he may not have been in Madura throughout.

Finally, there is a reference in John Nieuhoff,[38] which confirms the chronological re-adjustment elaborated in this investigation. With regard to the events of 1533, he says: 'After all, the Nayk of Madure, having found means to get into the possession of this country, left the Portuguese in the full possession of their jurisdiction over the Parvas, and of the free exercise of their religion'. This discussion leads to the conclusion that Viśvanātha Nāyaka, the founder of the Nāyak dynasty of Madura, was established in authority there not long before the death of the Vijayanagar emperor, Krishṇadēva Rāya, in 1530, *i.e.*, about 1529.

[38] p. 296. *Vide* Appendix C.

Chapter II

VIŚVANĀTHA NĀYAKA AND THE FOUNDATION OF THE NĀYAKSHIP

(c. 1529—1564)

Nāgama Nāyaka was one of the trusted officers of Krishṇadēva Rāya. He is variously described in the chronicles as his general, store-keeper (hence his title *Kōṭiya*), treasurer (*Tōśekhāna Adhikāri*), chief revenue officer, and viceroy of the south. It is, however, clear that he was responsible for the general supervision of the administration of the southern provinces. In this capacity he had probably control over a portion of king's army, besides his own forces. Such an exalted charge entrusted to Nāgama can be explained only by his antecedents. Inscriptions speak of him as a prominent figure in the previous reigns. He was the 'foremost servant' of Sāḷuva Narasinga and had agents under him.[1] He seems to have had much to do with the establishment of the Tuḷuva dynasty. The services of such a person Krishṇadēva Rāya retained, as was usual with wise kings in the case of their predecessors' devoted officers.

Nāgama's pilgrimage to Benares is narrated in detail by the chronicles; and he is said to have entrusted his office to Rāmabhadra Nāyaka in his absence. Whether he really undertook this distant and difficult journey or not, it is evident that want of male issue to perpetuate his family made him devote much time and labour in offering prayers to God Viśvanātha of Benares. The Kūniūr Plates of Venkaṭa II seem to suggest that Viśvanātha's birth was due to the severe austerities of his father and the favour of God Viśvēśvara. The date of this event is not definitely known. Since the chronicles say that Viśvanātha was about sixteen when he was introduced to Krishṇadēva Rāya, he may have been born about 1495.

As has already been remarked, Viśvanātha appears to have entered the service of the king as his 'betel-bearer'. The experienced and far-seeing Nāgama would have spared no pains to perfect his son's natural endowments. So Viśvanātha easily became one of the

[1] Appendix D, Nos. 4 and 2.

king's personal attendants. His handsome appearance, careful education, and manly courage enabled him to rise higher and higher in the estimation of the Rāya. He seems to have accompanied him in his expedition against the king of Orissa. Perhaps his devoted service in this campaign gained him the command of a battalion in the attack on, and capture of, Raichūr in 1520. When he was thus at the height of his fame and established in the king's confidence, he was deputed to the south to perform a delicate and difficult task.

The course of events leading to Krishṇadēva Rāya's interference in the affairs of his southern kingdom during the last years of his regin is clouded by the mists of tradition, and nothing certain can be said at present about the precise nature of the transactions that required his attention. It is said that a Chola king, Vīra Śēkhara, invaded the Pāṇḍya country, and dispossessed its king, Chandra Śēkhara, of his kingdom. Consequently the latter appealed to the Rāya for justice and for help in getting back his kingdom from the usurper. Though the whole country as far south as Cape Comorin formed part of the Vijayanagar empire, the old rulers were not done away with, and there were petty Pāṇḍya and Chola descendants ruling nominally in parts of their ancestral territories. But the emperor could not tolerate aggressive war between two of his feudatories, and he instantly organized the necessary expedition. As an officer responsible for the peace of the south, Nāgama, who was probably at headquarters then, was sent to remedy the injustice complained of by the Pāṇḍya, and put him in possession of his kingdom. In a short time, he defeated the Chola and deprived him of his acquisitions. The other part of his commission, viz., the restoration of the Pāṇḍya, he hesitated to execute. The recent troubles may have led him to a revision of the arrangements for the government of the country. To him order and security was everything, and he seems to have sacrificed all for it. He was a masterful personality and a thorough-going administrator ; and he would not perpetuate an arrangement which inevitably called for interference from the higher authorities. He may have realized that the previous arrangement of propping up petty and incapable rulers to satisfy their sentiments had failed, and that a drastic reorganization was necessary for the peaceful progress of the country. His dealings with the Pāṇḍya are not sufficiently clear ; but disagreements arose between them, which were brought to the notice of the emperor by the Pāṇḍya as a charge against him. Some chronicles, which are brief about this transaction, speak of the sudden disobedience of Nāgama, and the speedy punishment which the Rāya meted out to him. But the *Tanjāvūri Āndhra Rājula Charitra,* which details the circumstances, explains Nāgama's position better. He set forth his views in a strongly-worded note to the emperor. When he saw

that the Pāṇḍya was bent on going direct to the latter to complain, perhaps fearing misrepresentation of his attitude, he sent his faithful servant, Rāmabhadra Nāyaka, to headquarters. At last, when the emperor was prepared, at any cost, to restore the Pāṇḍya and continue the old arrangement, subversive of peace and order, perhaps unmindful of or not knowing fully the real state of affairs in the south, and unwilling to take any new step in his anxious days, Nāgama put on a bold front, and probably thought that he could bring him round later on to his way of looking at things. The Rāya's subsequent action may well have upset him.

It is said that Krishṇadēva Rāya was much enraged at Nāgama's insubordination, and appealed to his officers as to who among them would volunteer to punish the rebel. Only Viśvanātha, the latter's son, responded to this call; and, after some hesitation on the part of the Rāya, he was sent with a large army to deal with him. Negotiations failing, a battle is said to have been fought, and Nāgama brought as a captive to the emperor, who, in consideration of Viśvanātha's unique and extraordinarily loyal sense of duty to him, forgave his father. The whole story has a very romantic colouring. Most probably Nāgama was recalled from the south through the diplomatic offices of his son. Perhaps he yielded to the wishes of his very affectionate son with the idea of retiring from the king's service. After this nothing is known about him; the chronicles have nothing to say about his subsequent life or death.

Conferring with the Pāṇḍya, and learning more about the real facts from Nāgama, the emperor realized that only the latter's solution of the question was workable, since the former plainly admitted his inability to restore order in the country, and govern the intractable chiefs. So Viśvanātha was appointed Viceroy of the South with the titles, Chief of the Pāṇḍya Country and Lord of the Southern Throne.

Viśvanātha left Vijayanagar with a strong army to take charge of his office. On reaching Madura, he was not satisfied with the condition of its fort. With the cooperation of Ariyanātha, his Daḷavāy and Pradhani, and Kēśavappa Nāyaka, he reconstructed the fort with bastions, and built temples for God Sundara and Goddes Mīnākshī. His schemes for the improvement of the country were out of all proportion to its resources, and he is said, with a rare sense of public duty and generosity, to have lavishly spent his father's treasures on works of public utility. Meanwhile, according to the chronicles, the Pāṇḍya race became extinct, and Viśvanātha became the sole ruler of the country. This extinction may have reference to Chandra

Śēkhara Pāṇḍya and his family, not to the Pāṇḍyas of Tenkāśi, as the former is mentioned as the Pāṇḍya ruler and his illegitimacy is said to have been the cause of the Chola aggression.

Viśvanātha seems at first to have been the viceroy of the Chola country also. Some time after he had made preliminary arrangements for the administration of the kingdom, Krishṇadēva Rāya died (1530) and was succeeded by his younger brother, Achyuta Rāya. Shortly after, the Chola country was separated from the viceroyalty of Madura, and entrusted to Śevvappa Nāyaka, the husband of the younger sister of Achyuta Rāya's wife, Tirumalāmbā. Perhaps as a result of this new arrangement, Trichinopoly went to Madura and Vallam to Tanjore. This is spoken of by the chronicles as the exchange of these two places by Viśvanātha and the king of Tanjore. Evidently it must have been an imperial arrangement, not a mutual exchange as is suggested ; for the empire was yet too strong to allow so much independence to the provinces.

Viśvanātha seems to have taken the earliest opportunity to provide for the safety of Trichinopoly. The robber pest was first dealt with successfully. The jungle on both sides of the Kaveri were cleared, and thus the dens of robbers completely destroyed. The necessary police arrangements were made to safeguard the life and property of the pilgrims. The town was fortified, and a double wall and a big ditch were constructed around it. He paid particular attention to the temples of Trichinopoly and Śrīrangam, and the *Teppakuḷam* seems to owe its existence to him. It is not likely that he built the Śrīrangam temple, as is said in the chronicles ; probably he ordered extensive repairs and the erection of some new structures. The *Kōyiloḷuhu* records that he spent about three lakhs of *pons* for the temple. He seems to have built many houses, and encouraged habitation all around.

While Viśvanātha was engaged in the north, his general and coadjutor, Ariyanātha, was sent to the far south, the Tinnevelly country, to restore peace and order there. His task was by no means easy. He was faced with the hostility of the minor chiefs who had strongly organized themselves in the country round 'Kayattāttūr', ready to give battle, and who were prepared to acknowledge 'no earthly superior'. These called themselves 'Pancha Pāṇḍyas' (the Five Pāṇḍyas), but, according to some chronicles, they were the tributaries of the old Pāṇḍyas; and according to others, the illegitimate sons of the grandfather of Chandra Śēkhara. The inscriptions of the later Pāṇḍyas are conspicuous by their almost total absence in the Madura district even in the fiteenth century. Vijayanagar expansion to the

south may have driven them to a corner farther south. There seems to have been no legitimate Pāṇḍya king in Madura in the sixteenth century. The withdrawal of the real Pāṇḍyas to the environs of Tenkāśi perhaps brought into existence in Madura many illegitimate claimants, mutually questioning their legitimacy. Ariyanātha had to subdue such illegitimate Pāṇḍyas, or refractory vassals of the old rulers, who would not acquiesce in foreign rule, which was trying to establish a systematic and vigorous government, without a hard struggle. His conciliatory methods failed; and he seems to have been repulsed by them, when he requisitioned the help of Viśvanātha, who is said to have brought them round finally by his chivalry. Most probably a compromise was arrived at, and the minor chiefs were conciliated by their inclusion in his Pāḷaiyam System.

It is not clear whether Achyuta Rāya's Travancore campaign was undertaken in connection with this arrangement. Perhaps the old Pāṇḍyas, who had retired to Tenkāśi, instigated all this disaffection against the Madura ruler. In any case, this campaign was meant to put down all trouble from the Tiruvaḍi, who seems to have harboured enemies of Vijayanagar. Its successful conclusion removed for the time being all source of trouble for Viśvanātha. It appears that the Tenkāśi Pāṇḍyas became feudatory to Madura, and, to cement the alliance probably, a Pāṇḍya princess is said to have been given in marriage to Achyuta Rāya.[2] The Tiruvaḍi also became a tributary, and this is confirmed by the Suchīndram inscription of Bhūtalavīra Rāma Varman.[3] Therefore imperial intervention seems to have been required for the final settlement of Tinnevelly. It is difficult to believe that Viśvanātha achieved alone what was impossible for Ariyanatha and his army, as is maintained by the chronicles, which give a highly romantic and unconvincing account. The whole transaction connected with Achyuta's southern campaign clearly shows that Viśvanātha, though ruler of Madura, only occupied a very subordinate position with regard to the generals of the Empire. From the Krishṇāpuram Plates of Sadāśiva it appears that Krishṇappa Nāyaka, the son of Viśvanātha, played a prominent part in this affair.

Soon after the conquest of Tinnevelly, Viśvanātha and Ariyanātha concerned themselves with the improvement of the country. The town of Tinnevelly was much enlarged and improved; temples were erected, villages and streets opened, and every convenience of the

[2] 41 and 50 of 1900; *M. E. R.*, 1900, p. 27.
[3] Appendix D, No. 36.

inhabitants looked after. Agricultural interests were specially considered, and irrigation schemes were undertaken. Every inducement was given for bringing the whole country under cultivation. Everywhere foundations of peace and orderly administration were laid, and the advantages of beneficent rule extended.

Before Viśvanātha could bring the country under a regular system of administration, he had to undertake a military expedition against the Kambam-Gūḍalūr country, which ceased to pay tribute owing to its capture, it is said, by the Chola king.[4] Perhaps some dispossessed and discontented chief created trouble in that almost inaccessible place, by tracing his ancestry to the Cholas. Viśvanātha summoned his military officers, and gave the command to Rāmabhadra Nāyaka, his father's faithful subordinate, who is said to have successfully stormed the fort of Kambam, and reduced the country to submission. For his long and faithful services, Viśvanātha gave him the Pāḷaiyam of Vaḍakarai on the northern bank of the Vaigai.

Extent of the Kingdom.—The *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts* say that, 'while (Ariyanātha was) discharging the duties of both these responsible stations (Daḷavāy and Pradhāni), the extent of country acquired was from Utatur (Ūṛṛāttūr) and *Valikondapuram* on the north, even to *Caniya Cumari* (Cape Comorin) on the south; to *Coyambutur* (Coimbatore), *Irodu* (Erode), *Taraburam* (Dhārāpuram), and *Mele Mali* (Mēla Malai, Western Ghats) on the west; to *Ramiseram* (Rāmēśvaram) and the sea on the east.'[5] This translation by Taylor has been taken by Nelson to mean, the extent of the country on Ariyanātha's death in 1600. But the original Tamil passage[6] is to the effect that these were the boundaries of the kingdom under Viśvanātha. Taylor takes the clause referring to the latter as qualifying Ariyanātha, and this interpretation is against the obvious sense of the passage. Further, this description of the extent of the kingdom appears in dealing with Viśvanātha. It can only mean that, when Ariyanātha was holding the seals of the two offices mentioned, Viśvanātha's kingdom had these limits.

From the account of the chronicle, it appears that, before the death of Viśvanātha, the kingdom of Madura comprised roughly, in modern terminology, the districts of Madura, Ramnad, Tinnevelly, Trichinopoly, Coimbatore, and Salem, and a part of Travancore. The career of Viśvanātha, so far described, makes it clear that the

[4] Taylor, *C. R.*, iii, p. 377.
[5] *Ibid.*, *O. H.*, *MSS*, ii, p. 117.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 118.

Pāṇḍyan kingdom and a part of the Chola dominions came under his authority. The real question is whether Coimbatore and Salem were subordinate to him. We learn from the Jesuit letters that they were under Madura in the time of Tirumala Nāyaka. Inscriptions also confirm this. There appears to be no mention in chronicles or inscriptions that they were conquered by any of his predecessors. Sixteenth century epigraphical records of the Vijayanagar emperors are largely found in these districts. There is no doubt that they formed part of the Vijayanagar empire. Under these circumstances, it is probable that they were included in the Madura viceroyalty even at the commencement of the Nāyakship. It is likely that the title of Viśvanātha 'Lord of the Southern Throne' was something more than a mere name, even though the Madura Nāyaks are not often mentioned in the inscriptions of the sixteenth century in these districts. It is clear, however, that the maximum extent of the Nāyak dominions was reached before Viśvanātha's death. His successors had only to see to the integrity of the kingdom, and keep it free from the aggression of neighbours and foreigners. Mr. Rangachari is not clear with regard to Viśvanātha's dealings with Coimbatore and Salem, whether he had to conquer them or simply to accept their loyalty. He seems to include them amongst his conquests.[7]

While Viśvanātha's authority was recognized in all these territories, his practical control over them seems to have varied. Coimbatore and Salem do not appear to have received his attention as much as the other parts. The frontiers on that side became important only later on, when Mysore became independent and aggressive. It may be doubted whether the same system of administration was organized in them as in the other parts of the kingdom. It is probable that large tracts of the country were entrusted to powerful chiefs, who had only to pay tribute regularly to be left to themselves. With regard to the coast region, not only Viśvanātha but his successors also, seem to have left it under the administration of the commercial nations of the West, and satisfied themselves with mere tribute.[8]

Such an extensive kingdom seems to have been protected by a regular system of fortifications, not only on the frontiers but also in the interior. The chronicles give a long list of forts built by the Nāyaks.[9] It is difficult to say what Viśvanātha's share actually was. Mr. Rangachari gives him the whole credit for the organization of

[7] *I. A.*, 1915, p. 59.
[8] Nieuhoff, p. 295. *Vide* Appendix C.
[9] Taylor, *O. H. MSS.*, ii, p. 167.

the defence of the kingdom. In the early days of the Nayakship, there was practically no fear of aggression from anywhere. After the battle of Talikota, disorganization set in, and the various provinces of the Empire felt the necessity of looking after their own defence. In the case of Madura, foreign aggression came only in the seventeenth century. Therefore, what little Viśvanātha might have done for defence would not have been sufficient in later times; he could not have seen so far ahead.

Organization of the Pāḷaiyams:—After restoring peace and order, Viśvanātha and Ariyanātha organized the whole country for effective administration. They had to take into account the old local chieftains who were the vassals of the Pāṇḍyas, the emigrants from the north who had left their country either owing to the Muhammadan peril or in quest of 'pastures new', and their own faithful followers; and incorporate them all into a system of government, which would conduce to the peace and prosperity of the country. Agriculture was in a languishing condition; the land was mostly covered with forests, which endangered the safety and welfare of the people in many ways; and disorganization was prevalent everywhere. Under these circumstances, the central government by itself could not do much, without entrusting large power and freedom of action to local authorities. The adventurous spirit of the new-comers could well be diverted into peaceful activities if their ideas of self-importance were respected. Further, the defence of the country must be effectively provided for, to make united action possible in times of danger. Such political, economic, and military motives probably influenced Viśvanātha and Ariyanātha in instituting what is called the Pāḷaiyam System.

The chronicles speak of the division of the country into seventy-two Pāḷaiyams, and of each Pāḷaiyakāran or Polegar, the chief holding one of them, being responsible for the defence of one of the seventy-two bastions of the Madura fort. It is not definitely known how many Pāḷaiyams were originally constituted by Viṣvanātha, and whether others were not created by his successors. Later on, we find the confiscation of some of them. Perhaps these seventy-two were the survivals, taken into account by latter tradition as contained in the chronicles. It is likely that more were created at first, considering the clamant demands of Viśvanātha's multitudinous followers, and the arduous nature of the improvements to be effected in the country. Moreover, Dindigul alone is said to have consisted of about eighteen Pāḷaiyams, and it was too small in extent to represent one-fourth of the whole kingdom. Anyhow, it is hard to believe that the number of the Pāḷaiyams created in the beginning remained the same to the end of the Nāyak regime.

Viśvanātha's arrangement in this respect was a practical solution of the difficulties he was confronted with. He pacified his clamorous adherents and old, discontented chiefs by conferring on them a dignified status and definite proprietary rights over portions of land. By making the cession hereditary their self-love was flattered and their sense of responsibility increased. They were given complete powers of police and judicial administration. For good or for evil, they were masters in their small sphere. In return for this, they were to pay a tribute to the Nāyak of one-third of their income from land, and maintain, with another third part, the troops which their master would require in case of war. Practically they could enjoy more than one-third of their revenues. Further, liberal concessions in the tribute were allowed for loyal and public services, sometimes even to the extent of the whole amount.

The status and power of the various Polegars could not have been the same; it is extremely unlikely that all of them had equally good record of past services and equal possessions. In course of time at least, there would have been changes in their attitude and position. Consequently their obligations would have been different. Vico's letter of 1611[10] says that 'Hermécatte' (Erumaikaṭṭi), a powerful Polegar, very influential at court, 'has domains enough to be obliged to maintain for the Nāyak's service three thousand infantry, two hundred horses and fifty elephants'.

Thus the country was organized on a military basis. That the system could not, and did not, satisfy all, is evident from the rebellion which Viśvanātha's son had to deal with at the very commencement of his reign. But it was acceptable to most of the Polegars, as their loyalty did not fail for a very long time. This institution satisfied the requirements of the time; peace and order was established on a firm basis, and the country took rapid strides in agricultural improvement. Forests were cleared, and much waste land was brought under cultivation. The system was a good safeguard against foreign invasion and especially against foreign occupation. Madura did not share the fate of Gingi and Tanjore so long as it worked on right lines. The 'Polygar Wars', which preceded the establishment of the British Collectorate, show its vitality in its best days. Though life might be suspended at one blow in the centre, it could still pulsate with vigour in all the various parts. The complete conquest and subjugation of Madura would mean the separate conquest of all the Pāḷaiyams. But the system contained within itself the seeds of its decay. Everything depended on an overlord who could constantly keep the

10 Bertrand, II, p. 125. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 10.

turbulent chiefs in good humour, and on the good sense of the latter. If it were to degenerate, as it did later on, it could be the most potent engine of oppression and disorder. But at the time it was originated, no alternative was possible. It could have been improved later on when it showed signs of weakness, but no ruler felt called upon to keep its retrogressive tendencies in check. At last it weakened the central power and invited its own doom along with that of the other. A. J. Stuart[11] gives a qualified defence of this institution, but his European feudal analogy cannot be pressed except in a very general way. Bishop Caldwell[12] is not in a mood to appreciate its good side; he condemns the experiment outright, but does not suggest any alternative possible at that time. Nelson[13] is disposed to think that the scheme was as good as any that could be devised at such a time. Though the names of both Viśvanātha and Ariyanātha are mentioned in some chronicles in connection with the organization of the Pāḷaiyam System, others seem to credit its origination and application solely to the latter. It is true that the Polegars were specially attached to Ariyanātha and his name. It is likely that Viśvanātha entrusted his faithful officer and co-worker with the practical working out of the scheme, though it is difficult to assign its conception to either of them exclusively.

The question as to when the country was organized into Pāḷaiyams is difficult to solve definitely. Nelson[14] says that shortly after this work, Viśvanātha died; he therefore ascribes it to about 1563. The *History of the Carnataca Governors* records that Viśvanātha ruled for twenty-six years after this settlement. This puts the Pāḷaiyam organization about 1538. The account of Rāmabhadra Nāyaka, given by Taylor,[15] referring to the Vaḍakarai Pāḷaiyam, says that he enjoyed it for twenty years and died, and that his death was deplored by Viśvanātha. Thus the latter authority tends to confirm the statement of the former chronicle. If this Rāmabhadra Nāyaka is the Rāmappa Nāyaka of the inscriptions, the period of twenty years referred to will have to be between *c.* 1535 and 1552; for the latter's epigraphical records range between these two dates. The evidence of inscriptions, by apparently indicating a date somewhere about 1535, goes only to corroborate the information given by the *History of the Carnataca Governors*. Therefore Nelson's date has to be rejected. It is not clear how he arrived at his conclusion. His mistake is apparently due to his dating the foundation

11 *Manual of Tinnevelly*, p. 42.
12 *History of Tinnevelly*, pp. 58-9.
13 Page 98.
14 Page 101.
15 *C. R.*, III, pp. 377-8.

of the Nāyakship in 1559. Even then, it is not possible to explain his rejection of all this evidence.

Viśvanātha's Officers.—Viśvanātha was ably served in all his manifold and arduous undertakings by trustworthy officers. He retained in his service some of his father's devoted servants. Pre-eminent among these was Ariyanātha Mudaliyār. Born of poor parents in the neighbourhood of Conjeevaram, he rose to the very high and responsible position of Daḷavāy and Pradhāni of Viśvanātha by sheer merit. He co-operated with his master so conspicuously in all his labours that he is spoken of as his 'second in power' by Taylor.[16] A copper plate inscription of 1560 records a grant of twelve villages in the Tinnevelly country by Viśvanātha and Ariya-nātha.[17] Romance attributes to him feats of personal prowess and solutions of difficult and abstruse problems, which attracted the notice of the Rāya and procured for him startling elevation from post to post until at last he became the dictator of the Vijayanagar Empire.[18] His whole life is enveloped in tradition, which makes extravagant and bewildering claims to greatness on his behalf. His equestrian statue in *Pudumanḍapam* and the thousand-pillared hall are substantial relics of his importance.

Another prominent officer of Viśvanātha was Rāmabhadra Nāyaka, who did much to establish peace and order in the country and who was deeply attached to him. He is frequently referred to in the chronicles. It is highly probable that he is the Rāmappa Nāyaka of the inscriptions, which speak of him as the agent of Viṭṭhala in 129 of 1905, dated 1535, and 428 of 1916, dated 1552.[19] The latter inscription refers to a gift of his under the orders of the king. No. 121 of 1908, dated 1538, records his gift for the merit of Achyuta.[20] No. 65 of 1916, dated 1542, is a gift for his merit.[21] No. 119 of 1907, dated 1550, is another record of Rāmappa's name.[22]

Viśvanāth's son, Krishṇappa Nāyaka, figures in the inscriptions of his father's time in 1546, 1550, 1553, and 1555.[23] The Krishṇā-puram Plates of Sadāśiva refer to his part in the campaign against the Tiruvaḍi country. He must have been of great service to Viśva-nātha in his military undertakings.

16 *O. H. MSS.*, ii, p. 111.
17 Appendix D, No. 49.
18 Taylor, *O. H. MSS.*, ii, pp. 113-5.
19 Appendix D, Nos. 13 and 39.
20 Appendix D, No. 18.
21 *Ibid.*, No. 20.
22 *Ibid.*, No. 30.
23 *Ibid.*, Nos. 25, 32, 42 and 43.

Viśvanātha's Character and Work—That Viśyanātha was a warrior of high degree is eloquently testified by inscriptions. The chronicles make him a hero of chivalrous qualities playing his part under providential arrangement. In an inscription he is described as 'the best skilled in putting down disputes.'[24] That he must have possessed extraordinary tact and patience is evident from his successfull organization of the country amidst tremendous clashing of interests and temper. In all his success, his personality must have been an important contributory factor.

Mr. Rangachari is never tired of singing the praise of the 'remarkable career of this remarkable man'.[25] He goes even so far as to suggest that 'the historian will join the chroniclers, and praise, without hesitation and without limitation, his work as a ruler and administrator', and that 'he furnishes the subject of a free panegyric.'[26] Such hero-worship cannot stand close scrutiny. No doubt Viśvanātha was a practical administrator of great talents. The credit of restoring order in the country and organizing it on a quasi-peace footing certainly belongs to him. The institution of the Pāḷaiyam System of administration was the most practical solution of the difficulties. But he had not the far-seeing statemenship to provide for its inevitable dangers. This piece of constructive work is attributed by the chronicles more to Ariyanātha than to Viśvanātha. The latter left the Marava country in an unsatisfactory condition, a danger to the peace of the kingdom. He was trained in the Vijayanagar imperial system, and he made his mark in applying its principles in a systematic manner. There is much originality in his work, but it is difficult to say that he was not indebted to others. Viśvanātha was great in perceiving the crying needs of the times and providing for them effectively.

Another consideration that must modify our estimate of Viśvanātha's work is that, though ruler of Madura, he was not supreme in his dominions. He was eclipsed by greater men whose willing subordinate he was content to remain. In the southern compaign of Rāma Rāja Viṭṭhala, has does not appear to have figured prominently; and during the former's presence in the country, he seems to have played a very subordinate part. The country was too disturbed to allow Viśvanātha uncontrolled authority. On the whole, he seems to have faithfully executed the imperial plans for the adminis-

[24] *Ibid.*, No. 23.
[25] *I. A.*, 1916, p. 74.
[26] *Ibid.*, 1915, p. 60.
[27] Appendix D, Nos. 48, 33, 37 and 14 respectively.

tration of the kingdom. The Vijayanagar Empire was then strong enough to assert its control over the provinces.

The subordinate position of Viśvanātha is clear from inscriptions. He is referred to as the agent of Viṭṭhala in 385, 599, and 721 of 1916, and as the agent of Achyuta in 113 of 1908.[27] He recognizes the sovereignty of Achyuta and Sadāśiva in 113 of 1908, 622 of 1915, 599 of 1916, and in the Aṇṇiyūr inscription of 1560.[28] There are some inscriptions which make the position of Viṭṭhala supreme in the affairs of the South. The existence of a few coins of Viśvanātha[29] does not go against his subordination to the Vijayanagar Empire. It appears to have been customary for the provincial rulers of the empire to have an independent coinage of their own (limited probably to smaller denominations) as is evident from the following observation of Caesar Frederick: —'When we came into a new Governer's country, although tributary to the King, every one of them stamped a several coin of cropper, so that the money we took this day would not serve the next.'[30]

While thus Viśvanātha was a loyal representative of Vijayanagar in the South, he exercised much power in the internal administration of the country. His work bears the mark of individuality. Remission of taxes by him is referred to in inscriptions. The Pāṇḍyas of Tenkāśi were his loyal feudatories, and their power gradually increased under his fostering care. Their inscriptions during Viśvanātha's administration are numerous. Viśvanātha and Ativīrarāma are mentioned in an inscription of 1558,[31] and the latter was crowned Pāṇḍyan king in 1564. The former's coins show Pāṇḍya emblems like the fish. No. 16 of Hultzsch's collection, above referred to, has on the obverse the legend 'Pāṇḍiyan' and on the reverse 'Viśvanādan'. Viśvanātha's son, Krishṇappa Nāyaka, must have continued the same policy of close co-operation with the Pāṇḍyas. Hence perhaps his title 'Pāṇḍyakulasthāpanāchārya' in the Krishṇāpuram Plates of Sadāśiva. Viśvanātha had agents under him, like Uddaṇḍar,[32] and there are inscriptions which record grants for his merit.

Viśvnātha's age and death.—The date of the death of Viśvanātha is not recorded in any of the chronicles. The only definite information which throws light on this question is the statement in the

27 Appendix D, Nos. 48, 33, 37 and 14 respectively.

28 *Ibid.*, Nos. 14, 51, 33 and 50.

29 The Rev. J. E. Tracy, *Pandyan Coins*, p. 6; *I. A.*, 1892, p. 325. Nos. 15 and 16.

30 Purchas, *His Pilgrimes*, x, p. 99.

31 Appendix D, No. 47.

32 *Ibid.*, No. 34.

Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts that he had his son, Krishṇappa Nāyaka, crowned on 11th Tai, Rudhirōdagāri (about the 25th of January, 1564). Though Mr. Rangachari thinks that this is a 'more accurate date' than that given by the other chronicles, he says that Krishṇappa Nāyaka ascended the throne in 1562 and Viśvanātha died in 1563. Probably he goes wrong in the equation of the cyclic year and date. Nelson puts Viśvanātha's death in December, 1563; he does not seem to take into account the crowning of his son before his death, which is recorded in the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts*[33] and the *History of the Carnataca Governors.*[34] It is very likely that Viśvanātha desired some rest after his arduous labours. Therefore Krishṇappa Nāyaka's accession may be placed in the beginning of 1564 and his father's death some time after. The former's Krishṇapuram inscription,[35] which is taken to have been issued in 1563, is for the merit of his father, who may have died before it; but the date of this inscription has to be revised. The Śaka date given in it is supposed to be correct and equated to the English date, and the cyclic year Krōdhana is brushed aside as wrong, by the Madras Department of Epigraphy. When these two dates do not agree, it seems reasonable to take the Śaka date to be wrong in general; for the cyclic year was more frequently used, not only in official documents but also in the every-day transactions of life, by the Hindus. There is therefore greater likelihood of the creeping in of a wrong Śaka date than of a wrong cyclic year unless there are special reasons to discredit the latter. Accordingly the date of the above-mentioned inscription must be 1565, and the death of Visvanātha may well have happened in 1564.

With regard to the probable age of Viśvanātha at the time of his death, Mr. Rangachari makes the following observations: 'He was born in the beginning of the 16th century or a decade before. He could not have been more than 60 at the time of his death in 1563.'[36] 'He gave up his life in the midst of his labours at evidently a comparatively early age of about 55 or 64.'[37] In 1559 Viśvanātha is said to have been 'in the prime of manhood.'[38] From these references Mr. Rangachari's position seems to be very vague, confused, and even contradictory. As we have remarked before, Viśvanātha was probably born about 1495, and consequently he may have died when he was nearing seventy.

33 Taylor, *O. H. MSS.*, ii, p. 117.
34 *Ibid.*, pp. 18 and 20—Tamil passage.
35 Appendix D, No. 56.
36 *I. A.*, 1916, p. 75, *n*.
37 *Ibid.*, p. 75.
38 *I. A.*, 1914, p. 254.

CHAPTER III

KRISHṆAPPA NĀYAKA I

(1564—1572)

Kumāra Krishṇappa, the son of Viśvanātha, was crowned, according to the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts*, on the 11th of Tai, Rudhirōdgāri, corresponding approximately to the 25th of January, 1564. Though Mr. Rangachari dates his accession in 1562, he remarks that the first event of his reign was the battle of Talikota and the sack of Vijayanagar in 1565. It is more probable that the discontent of some Polegars culminated in a formidable rebellion soon after his accession and the death of his father. It is not unlikely that the sending of a part of the army for the empire's defence precipitated this crisis, as Nelson contends. But the Muhammadan attack on Vijayanagar came rather suddenly, and it is probable that help from Madura arrived only a little late, i.e. in the beginning of 1565. Even the presence of Ariyanātha in Madura, it appears, would not have made much difference in the attitude of Tumbichchi Nāyaka, the leader of the rebellion. The accession of a ruler would have afforded the necessary stimulus. The Pāḷaiyam settlement of Viśvanātha could not possibly have satisfied all parties, and he may have specially favoured some of his northern followers in preference to others among them. Moreover, the antecedents of Tumbichchi Nāyaka were sure to make him supremely disgusted with his humble role under the new dispensation. From the chronicles it is clear that he was a man of some influence and power in Madura. An inscription at Kīḷakkarai[1] mentions him along with Achyuta Rāya. In another record of Śōbhakrīt (1543), a certain Rāma Rāya Tummiśi bears such titles as 'head of the Śillavārs', 'king of Vanga', etc.[2] A Jesuit letter of 1608[3] describes a 'Toumishirāyen' (perhaps his descendant) as the chief of all the Toṭṭiyars. Such an influential and turbulent chieftain could not but regret his modest status as one among numerous Polegars. He easily collected

1 Appendix D, No. 255.
2 *Ibid* , No. 12.
3 Bertrand, ii, p. 19.

a large number of his followers and discontented chiefs, entrenched himself at Paramakuḍi, after strengthening fortifications, devastated the country around, and defied the authority of Krishṇappa Nāyaka. The latter is said to have acted with great alacrity and resourcefulness, and entrusted the conduct of operations to Pedda Kēśavappa Nāyaka (his father's officer), who is described as the Daḷavāy. Tumbichchi Nāyaka seems to have obstinately resisted his forces, and he is said to have killed him. Probably foiled in the first attempt, Krishṇappa Nāyaka sent his late general's son, Chinna Kēśava, along with about thirteen Polegars, a large number of troops, and a few pieces of ordnance, to strom the fort. This second attempt seems to have been successful; Tumbichchi was captured and beheaded. It is said that Krishṇappa Nāyaka treated the rebel's two sons with generosity, and entrusted them with Paramakuḍi, Parambūr, and some neighbouring villages which constituted a small Pāḷaiyam. The remaining portion of Tumbichchi Nāyaka's territories was confiscated, perhaps to teach a lesson to other refractory Polegars. These proceedings clearly show that, though Viśvanātha's organization of the country gave rise to some dissatisfaction, it had, on the whole, ensured the loyalty and co-operation of most of the Polegars to his successors.

Invasion of Ceylon.—The *Singhala dvipa Catha*[4] gives a long account of Krishṇappa Nāyaka's conquest of Ceylon. It has such a convincing appearance of truth about it that it is highly probable that an expedition was undertaken. A brief summary of the chronicle may be given here. Krishṇappa Nāyaka was spoken of slightingly by the king of Kanḍi, a friend of Tumbichchi Nāyaka, because of the latter's execution. Outraged at this, he called for the services of fifty-two of his Polegars with their troops, and embarked for Ceylon at *Navapāshāṇa* and landed at Mannār. A conciliatory message requiring homage and tribute was rejected by the king of Kanḍi, who sent 40,000 men under four *mantris* (ministers) and eight *dēśanāthalu* (governors) to arrest the progress of the invaders. A sanguinary engagement took place at Puttaḷam, in which the Kanḍian army was defeated by Chinna Kēśava Nāyaka (the general who finally put down the rebellion of Tumbichchi Nāyaka) with 20,000 troops and a few chiefs. Two ministers, five chieftains, and others were taken prisoners, and treated with much humanity and consideration by Krishṇappa Nāyaka. The captives urged their king in vain to yield. The latter collected 60,000 troops and 10,000 Kaffirs (probably Portuguese), and marched at their head to the battle-field. A bloody struggle ensued in which 8,000 Kaffirs and

[4] Taylor, *C. R.*, iii, pp. 183-6.

about as many Sinhalese lost their lives. In spite of the best efforts of Krishṇappa Nāyaka and his general, the king of Kanḍi was not captured alive. His dead body was taken with due honours to the capital. The Madura ruler remained there for three days. The deceased king's family was sent to *Auramgam*, the old capital of Ceylon, and treated in a fitting manner. After appointing his brother-in-law, Vijaya Gopāla Nāyaka, his viceroy in Ceylon, and arranging for the regular payment of tribute, Kaishṇappa Nāyaka returned to Madura.

This account represents the Madura Nāyak in the best light possible. It may have been written by one of the adherents of the Nāyaks. It gives very elaborate details, and is very precise and sober, though some of its statements cannot be accepted without qualification. The cause of the invasion seems to have been the withholding of the usual tribute. This subordinate position of Ceylon with regard to Madura is intelligible in the light of the claims of the Vijayanagar emperors, Krishṇadēva, Achyuta, and Sadāśiva Rāyas, to have conquered Ceylon. According to the chronicle abstracted above, homage and tribute were demanded even before actual fighting began; and in the end arrangements were made for the proper remittance of tribute. It is unlikely, under the circumstances of his position, that Krishṇappa Nāyaka would have undertaken this expedition to wipe out the insult said to have been offered to him by the ruler of Kanḍi. There is some partisanship in the careful omission of all details which might go against the Madura ruler, who is throughout presented as a faultless man. The appointment of a viceroy appears doubtful, as there is no evidence to show that there were close relations between Madura and Ceylon after this expedition, which a viceroyalty would necessitate. Perhaps an officer was appointed to receive and remit tribute.

Epigraphical evidence for this invasion of Ceylon is meagre. Perhaps Sadāśiva's boast in Raktākshi (1564-5) of his having 'looted' Ceylon[5] is subsequent to this; if so, the whole expedition would have been completed in a short time. There is a Tāramangalam inscription of 1567[6] which refers to a Vīra Vasanta Rāya, 'who conquered Ceylon'. There is no specific reference in Turnour and Wijesimha's *Mahāvaṁśa* to a Madura invasion of Ceylon about this time, but this period of Ceylon history seems to have been one of trouble and confusion. However, it is very probable from the other sources that Krisṇappa Nāyaka led an expedition to Ceylon, and

[5] Appendix D, No. 57.

[6] 19 of 1900 ; *M. E. R.*, 1900, p. 31 ; Sewell, i, p. 200.

that it was not for conquest, but for the enforcement of the payment of tribute which was due from her, which she had not paid properly.

Mr. Rangachari remarks that Nelson's conclusion,[7] viz. that the war was a fact, is 'worthy of acceptance'.[8] His statement that it never happened, according to Taylor, is not sufficiently borne out. The latter only expresses himself in very cautious terms which are probably justified by the nature of the evidence he had to deal with : 'The narrative in this manuscript is too particular, as to names, places, and circumstances, to be a mere invention . . . . I have no doubt that confirmation of the general fact of such an invasion and conquest of Ceylon is obtainable from papers in the collection if the same really happened'.[9]

Krishṇappa Nāyaka's Attitude towards Vijayanagar:— Mr. Rangachari's opinion on this question does not seem to be quite decided ; in one place, he says that 'his loyalty is clear';[10] in another, that his relation to the emperor is 'one of uncertainty',[11] meaning probably the full details of that relationship. To establish Krishṇappa's loyalty to the empire in 1565, Mr. Rangachari relies on an inscription of 1561. The Krishṇapuram Plates of Sadāśiva, dated 1567, prove this question beyond a shadow of doubt: Krishṇappa Nāyaka is referred to in them in many eulogistic terms with several high-sounding titles, and described as one 'who knew the truth about duty', etc.[12] There are other references to Krishṇappa Nāyaka in the inscription of Sadāśiva, dated 1568 and 1571,[13] the latter of which is a gift for the merit of the Nāyak. Whatever may be the defects of the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts* dealing with the life of Ariyanātha, it may be true that he was sent to Vijayanagar to do his best to ward off the Muhammadan peril. Nothing definite is known about his services to the empire at this critical time. Mr. Rangachari narrates in detail all the wild, inconsistent, and improbable tales about his movements and behaviour in the north. The fact that he returned to, and permanently settled in, Madura within less than two years after the battle of Talikota (in Akshaya, i.e. 1566-7) clearly shows that he became very much chastened by experience, and came back 'a sober

7 p. 104.

8 *I.A.*, 1916, p. 88.

9 Taylor, *C.R.*, iii, p. 186.

10 *I.A.*, 1916, p. 83.

11 *Ibid.*, p. 87.

12 *E.I.*, ix, pp. 32-842 ; Appendix D, No. 61.

13 Appendix D, Nos. 63 and 67.

and a wiser man', if he had high ambitions. On the basis of such authorities, probably, Mr. Rangachari makes bewildering guesses in attempting to explain Ariyanātha's return.[14]

After his return from the north in 1566-7, Ariyanātha probably concerned himself much with works of a quasi-public nature. He is said to have called his relatives from Conjivaram, settled them in Śōḷavandān and other villages, built them houses and a temple, and supplied all the needs of a place of habitation. He seems to have amused himself with building and improving temples and other structures all over the kingdom of Madura. But much is made of the statement in the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts* that he was Daḷavāy and Pradhāni during four successive reigns till 1600. Mr. Rangachari speaks of Ariyanātha as the chief friend and counsellor of Krishṇappa Nāyaka. Following Nelson, he thinks that he was the guiding spirit in the administration of the country till his death, and that the Nāyaks were merely his instruments. There is hardly adequate evidence to support such a weighty conclusion. Probably he was holding the two principal offices in name, and in recognition of his past services ; there is an inscription of 1570,[15] which refers to him as the agent of Viśvanātha Nāyaka, Krishṇappa Nāyakā, and Vīrappa Nāyaka.

The early years of the reign of Krishṇappa Nāyaka seem to have been a very anxious period. He had to provide for the peace of the country troubled by a few hot-headed Polegars under the leadership of Tumbichchi Nāyaka ; he had to put the Ceylon ruler in the right attitude of a subordinate paying regular tribute ; he had, further, to see that the imperial cause was not endangered by his default. While discharging these duties, he seems to have been not unmindful of the work of peaceful administration and progress. He is said to have built Krishṇāpuram, a town to the east of Palamcotta, and another called Kaḍaiyam—Krishṇāpuram to the west of Tinnevelly. The former seems to have received greater attention from him. The Krishṇāpuram Plates of Sadāśiva record the grant of a number of villages to the Tiruvēngaḍanātha temple, built there by Krishṇappa Nāyaka, 'encircled by a wall . . . and a broad and lofty tower, with a large *ranga-manḍapa* raised on a collection of beautiful stone pillars and adorned with rows of sprouts'. 'He bulit a car . . . and also broad roads round the temple . . . for God Vishṇu set up there.'[16] He is said to have built a Śiva temple also, constructed a *Teppakuḷam*

[14] *I.A.*, 1916, p. 85.

[15] Appendix D, No. 66.

[16] *E.I.* ix, p. 328, vv. 55-7.

and several *agrahāras*, and looked after the other needs of the town. The Krishṇāpuram inscription of Krōdhana (1565)[17] records the grant of six villages and some land in Āḷikuḍi to the same temple. Probably the town was built earlier, not necessarily in Krishṇappa Nāyaka's reign, and was improved now. Inscriptions refer to his benefactions to other temples.

Krishṇappa Nāyaka's Character and Work:—Krishṇappa Nāyaka seems to have distinguished himself even during the administration of his father. The earliest inscription referring to him[18] is one for his merit, dated 1546. Sadāśivā's inscription of 1550[19] mentions him. An inscription of 1553 records his gift of land to a temple; in another of 1555, Ekāmbara Mudaliyār, his agent, makes a gift of land.[20] Records dated 1562 are those of his gift to temples.[21] The Krishṇāpuram Plates of Sadāśiva, dated 1567, describe him as 'the lord of *Kānchipura* and *Ailāvaḷipura*, who, by his valour, deprived the insolent King of the Tiruvaḍi-rājya of the seven (component) parts (of his kingdom)[22]; who was famous as the Pāṇḍyakula-sthāpanāchārya, who was the revered lord of the Southern Ocean.' These expressions clearly indicate his share in the campaigns against the Travancore country and the Pāṇḍyas in the reign of Achyuta Rāya, and in the campaigns at Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala later. He appears as the equal of his father in martial qualities, and as a notable imperial general. His other characteristics of wisdom, mercy, uprightness, and generosity are emphasized in this epigraphical record, which confirms, to a great extent, the opinion of the chronicles. He seems to have been a capable and wise ruler, bearing the welfare of his subjects constantly in mind. His marked individuality and reputation would have rendered any rise of Ariyanātha's influence beyond limits impossible. He gave the country strong beneficent rule, which was badly needed at the time. He vigorously checked the evil ways of some of the Polegars, and by his firmness and moderation taught them respect for constituted authority.

His Death:—After a somewhat short reign of nearly nine years, he died on the 19th of Kārtikai, Āngirasa (about the 3rd of December

17 Appendix D, No. 56.

18 *Ibid.*, p. 87.

19 Appendix D, No. 25.

20 *Ibid.*, Nos. 42 and 43.

21 *Ibid.*, Nos. 53 and 55.

22 Tiruvaḍikshmāpa Saptāngaharaṇaujasā.

1572). This is the date given by one of the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts* that generally gives some details about the dates which do not often seriously conflict with inscriptions. Mr. Rangachari relies, it seems, on the *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle*, which gives Māsi, Āngirasa; but there is a Dhārāpuram inscription[23] of Vīrappa Nāyaka, his successor, which is dated 9th Mārgaḷi, Āngirasa. Hence the date of the latter chronicle will have to be rejected. Krishṇappa Nāyaka must have died about the beginning of December, 1572.

[23] Appendix D, No. 68.

CHAPTER IV

VĪRAPPA NĀYAKA

(1572—1595)

Vīrappa Nāyaka succeeded his father on the throne towards the end of 1572. Mr. Rangachari, following Nelson, speaks of a dual royal authority : 'A remarkable feature in the position of these rulers was the joint holding of the royal dignity by brothers.'[1] Nelson[2] says: 'The two sons (of Krishṇappa Nāyaka)........were permitted by Ārya Nāyaka to rule the country with co-ordinate authority.' This view seems to be based on Taylor's translation of the Tamil manuscripts, where the expression 'second in power' is used. But Taylor makes Ariyanātha 'second in power' to Viśvanātha. The chronicles no doubt frequently speak of a 'Chinna Dorai' associated in government; at the same time they almost invariably say that the one was crowned and the other made 'China Dorai'. But Nelson and Mr. Rangachari do not speak of joint rule throughout; they confine their view to the period between 1573 and 1600. The former admits that when Vīrappa Nāyaka died in 1595, he was succeeded by his sons ; but he presumes, therefore, that his co-ruler must have died before. In the case of Virappa Nāyaka, a co-ruler is not mentioned in most of the chronicles. It appears that Nelson was guided by the *Paṇḍyan Chronicle,* which, however, speaks of Viśvanātha and Vīrappa as rulers, not in the reverse way taken by him and Mr. Rangachari. The *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts* do not refer to any joint rulers at all. Taylor does not go to the extent that Nelson does, but expresses himself with much restraint and caution : 'It is to be presumed, from the first mention here occuring, that the *subsequent custom* of committing a *secondary authority* to a younger brother of the reigning prince, carrying with it a right to the throne in case of the elder one leaving no legitimate posterity, was now first begun'[3]

The evidence of inscriptions goes directly against this theory of Nelson. The Kūniyur Plates of Venkaṭa II, and the Veḷḷangudi

[1] *I. A.,* 1916, p. 81.

[2] p. 105.

[3] *O. H. MSS.,* ii, p. 144.

Maduraittalavaralāṟu ; Taylor, *O. H. MSS.,* i, p. 37.

Plates and the Daḷavāy Agrahāram Plates of Venkaṭa I which give a genealogy of the early Nāyaks, are absolutely silent about joint rulers. From other inscriptions there is no ground for supposing that there was joint rule among these Nāyaks at any time. The probability in the circumstances is that some member of the royal family next to the ruler was associated in power in a way similar to the time-honoured custom of the Cholas, or to that of some of the present-day Rājas of India in having a Yuvarāja or Eḷayarāja.

Though Mr. Rangachari speaks of 'Viśvanātha II' as the colleague of Vīrappa Nāyaka, he describes everywhere the work of the latter. The only important event which tended to disturb the peace of the country seems to have been the rebellion of a Māvali Vāṇādarāya. The chronicles speak of a Sundarattōḷ Māvali Vāṇādarāyar and others as illegitimate sons of a Pāṇḍya king, who were crowned in succession kings of Madura by Lakkaṇa Nāyaka, and whose period of rule was in the second half of the fifteenth century.[4] Probably the rebel against Vīrappa Nāyaka was one of their descendants. There are a number of inscriptions of these Vāṇādarāyars in the sixteenth century, which are found in Tirupullāṇi, Kāḷaiyārkōvil, and Dēvipaṭṭaṇam in the Ramnad district.[5] Therefore it is very likely that they had some pretensions and cherished high ambitions. Viśvanātha, in all probability, conciliated them by giving them a dignified place in his Pāḷaiyam System, It is not clear what occasioned their hostile activity under Vīrappa Nāyaka, and who it was that was actually responsible for it. The choronicles say that the king of Māvalivanam fortified Mānāmadurai and Kāḷaiyākōvil and took possession of the neighbouring territory. The action of Vīrappa Nāyaka is described as having been prompt and decisive. He brought the transaction to a close by the confiscation of his Paḷaiyam. It is curious that Mr. Rangachari should think that 366 of 1901 (an error for 366 of 1909)[6], which mentions a Vāṇādarāyar as the agent of Vīrappa Nāyakaraiyan, 'evidently refers to his defeat and later

[4] Māvali Vāṇādarāyan was the title of chiefs of the Bāṇa country in the basin of the Pālār, the extent of whose territory changed according to the vicissitudes of history. It seems likely that some of them were transferred to this region as a result of the war that Kulottunga III had to carry on against the ruling Pāṇḍyas during the years 1261-72. When the Pāṇḍyas gained the ascendancy, the chieftains appointed to rule these territories had apparently borne these titles, if they did not belong to the family. Hence this region had been under a succession of chiefs to this title who held on to their strongholds even during the temporary occupation of Madura by a succession of Muhammadan Sultans from 1310-78. They are found mentioned in the early inscriptions of Vijayanagar under Harihara I, and Lakkaṇa's recognition of their position under Dēvarāya II follows as a matter of course.—*Ed.*

[5] Appendix D, Nos. 5, 7, 8, 9, and 11.

[6] Appendix D, No. 103.

loyalty'.[7] This inscription is dated Parābhava (1606) and is found at Tāyanūr (Tirukkvōvilūr taluk, South Arcot district), while the transactions recorded in the chronicle have reference to the present-day district of Ramnad. The strong measure taken by Vīrappa Nāyaka after his revolt seems to preclude the probability of 'later loyalty'.

Nelson and Mr. Rangachari take Vīrappa Nāyaka for a *roi fainèant* under the masterful thumb of Ariyanātha, who, according to the latter, was 'in reality the sovereign of the country'. As has been remarked before, Ariyanātha may have been Daḷavāy and Pradhāni in name, but there is absolutely no real evidence of his dominating influence. There is not even an incidental reference to him in inscriptions throughout the long reign of Vīrappa Nāyaka. The latter figures largely in them, and in a record of 1594[8] he is said to have 'levied tribute from every country'. The chronicles, in treating of his reign, say nothing about Ariyanātha's position and power. Vīrappa Nāyaka seems to have had perfect control over his feudatories, the Pāṇḍyas of Tenkāśi and the Tiruvaḍi.[9] The inscriptions of Vijayanagar emperors invariably refer to him as the ruler. Other numerous inscriptions of his make it clear that he had a strong hold over all his wide dominions, and was the real master of the country.

His Attitude towards the Vijayanagar Emperors.—Inscriptions show that Vīrappa Nāyaka continued the policy of subordination and loyalty towards the Vijayanagar emperors, which his father and grandfather had followed. Epigraphical records of the Vijayanagar emperors are found in the Nāyak dominions. The Daḷavāy Agrahāram Plates of Veṅkaṭa I, dated 1586, record a gift in accordance with the wishes of Vīrappa Nāyaka.[10] Other records of this emperor indicate that he exercised greater control over the south than his two immediate predecessors; these are an inscription at Pirānmalai, dated 1588,[11] another at Erode in the same year,[12] and a grant of some villages in the Tinnevelly district to a Vishṇu temple under the management of a certain Krishṇadās of 1590.[13] In the Śermādēvi

[7] *I.A.*, 1916, p. 91.
[8] Appendix D, No. 88.
[9] *Ibid.*, Nos. 76 and 70.
[10] *E.I.*, xii, pp. 159-87.
[11] Appendix D, No. 81.
[12] *Ibid.*, No. 84.
[13] *Ibid.*, No. 85.

inscription of Śrīranga, dated 1594[14] Virappa is mentioned as a feudatory. Vīrappa's Krishṇāpuram inscription of 1577[15] mentions Śrīranga; in the Śērmādēvi inscription of 1578[16] he calls himself Śrīranga's agent. Though there were three successive emperors ruling at Penukoṇḍa during this period, only Venaṭa's control appears to have been predominent. There is no doubt about Vīrappa's loyalty to all of them, including Tirumala and Śrīranga, but their influence on Madura affairs seems to have depended on their power. A gradual tightening of the imperial control is, however, perceptible towards the end of the reign of Venkaṭa I.[17]

Vīrappa Nāyaka's comparatively long reign seems to have been a period of peace and prosperity. The chronicles speak of his improvements in the Trichinopoly fort, the construction of a fort at Aruppukkōṭṭai (Ramnad), the building of the walls of defence around the Chidambaram temple, and the grant of many *agrahāras* in charity. There is no mention in them of any benefactions of his to the temple of Sundarēśvara and Mīnākshī in Madura. The *Tiruppaṇimālai* verses (52—4) enumerate, however, his construction of the *Veḷḷiyambalam*, the northern *gōpurrm*, the *Śērvīśvaram*, the kitchen, the thousand-pillared *manḍapa* (pavilion with a thousand pillars), the *Mūrtiyamman manḍapa*, the *Suṟṟu manḍapa* (pavilion around the temple) in the second *prākāra* (enclosing wall and circumambulating space), and the *Vīrappa manḍapa* with sculptured pillars. He is said to have covered the pillars of the *manḍapa* of the Mīnākshī temple with gold. The Daḷavāy Agrahāram Plates of Venkaṭa I (1586) seem to confirm this to some extent : they say that 'Vīrabhūpati constructed a *manḍapa* of rare sculptures in front of the shrine of Sundara

14 *Ibid*, No. 87.

15 *Ibid.*, No. 70.

16 *Ibid.*, No. 72.

17 When, after the battle of Talikota, the capital changed to Penukoṇḍa, the authority of the headquarters over Madura apparently continued intact. The empire was however, composed of three separate charges, over each of which was placed a prince under the sovereign authority of the ruler for the time-being. This arrangement first came into use on the death of Tirumala I, when Śrīranga succeeded to the empire with headquarters at Penukoṇḍa; his brother, Rāma, became viceroy or 'vice-regent' at Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam, and the last brother, Venkaṭa, became similarly viceroy of Madura. Śrīranga died without issue; Rāma predeceased him; and Venkaṭa became emperor in his turn. It was at this time that there was a rebellion or an attempt at one, in Madura. Venkaṭa sent his nephew, Tirumala, son of Rāma, to put down the rebellion. Instead of doing so, he made common cause with enemy and went over to Śrīrangapapaṭṭaṇam. Venkaṭa had subsequently to carry on the war against Madura and bring it back to its allegiance, while Śrīrangapaṭaṇam remained practically independent.—*Ed.*

Nāyaka and presented the Goddess Mīnākshī with a gold *kavacha* (mail-coat studded with gems)'.[18] An inscription in the temple of Sundarēśvara,[19] dated 1584, refers to the construction of the *Kambattaḍi manḍapa* with a number of sculptured pillars representing Purānic scenes. Thus Vīrappa Nāyaka devoted much of his wealth to religious works.

He appears to have to been an impartial ruler very much concerned with the proper administration of justice. The Gōripāḷaiyam inscription of Bhava, i.e. 1574,[20] refers to a dispute with regard to a large piece of land, said to have been granted to the Muhammadans by a Kūn Pānḍya. Vīrappa Nāyaka conducted an elaborate inquiry, according to the inscription, and confirmed the old grant. This also indicates his attitude towards Pānḍyas ; he appears to have been well disposed towards them. If the Pudukottai Plates of Śrī Vallabha were issued in 1583, his relation towards the Pānḍyas as over-lord is clear.

Introduction of Christianity.—About 1592, towards the close of Vīrappa Nāyaka's reign, the jesuit missionaries, working among the Paravas, established a mission in Madura under Father G. Fernandez, to convert the people of the country, especially the higher classes. They got permission from the Nāyak to build a church and presbytery. The whole-hearted and unostentatious work of Frenandez bore no fruit; he worked in vain for about fourteen years, without being able to convert anybody. The principal cause of his failure was the great contempt which the people felt for the Portuguese[21] (or the *Parangis*, as they were called) owing to their eating beef, drinking intoxicating liquors, and associating themselves with the Paṛaiyas. Albert Laerzio, in his letter of November 20, 1909, says : 'Nothing can remove this disagreeable impression, neither the noble course of the Portuguese, the magnitude of their power, the glitter of their wealth, nor the glory of their victories and conquests.'[22] Further, Fernandez had not a proper appreciation of the real difficulties and had neither brain nor courage to find out the best mode of approach

18 *E.I.*, xii, pp. 159-87.

19 Appendix D, No. 77.

20 *Ibid.*, No. 69.

21 There is a graphic description of the Portuguese contingent as it appeared in the battle of Toppūr, which gives an idea of contemporary opinion, in Yagñanārāyaṇa Dīkshita's *Sāhityaratnākaram*. See pp. 273 and 282, *Sources of Vijayanagar History*, No. 1 of this series.—*Ed.*

22 Bertrand, ii, p. 2.

under the circumstances. Thus the first attempt to convert the high-class Hindus of Madura to Christianity was a complete failure.

Vīrappa's death.—After a regin of about twenty-two years and nine months, Vīrappa Nāyaka died, according to a *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscript*, in Āvaṇi, Manmatha (the beginning of September, 1595). His last inscription is dated Jaya[23]; the earliest inscription of his successor is in Manmatha;[24] hence Vīrappa must have died at least before April, 1596. So the date given by the above-mentioned chronicle may be taken to be correct.

[23] Appendix D, No. 88.
[24] *Ibid.*, No. 91.

CHAPTER V

KRISHṆAPPA NĀYAKA II

(1595—1601)

Virappa Nāyaka had three sons: Kumāra Krishṇappa Viśvappa, and Kastūri Rangappa. He was succeeded by the eldest, known also as Vīra Krishṇa, in September, 1595. Nelson speaks of the joint rule of Krishṇappa and Viśvappa. Mr. Rangachari thinks that the latter was the elder brother. Both agree in saying that the joint rulers were in the leading-strings of old Ariyanātha. They regard the death of the latter as the most important event of this period. While Nelson[1] welcomes it as the deliverance of the Nāyaks from his benumbing influence and as the removal of the chief stumbling-block to all progress, Mr. Rangachari deplores it 'not only a loss but (a) disaster'; for 'Āriyanātha . . . gave the Nāik kingdom its strength and its security, its organization and its resources.'[2] 'Besides guiding the kings of Madura, he took upon himself the task of maintaining the integrity of the Empire and saving the descendants of Krishṇa-dēva Rāya from the shadow of neglect and danger of extinction.'[3] 'He, in short, . . . kept the union of the tottering empire by his loyalty.'[4] Taylor's warning[5] that 'any conjectures founded on these indications may for the present be spared' has been neglected with a vengeance; there is not an iota of evidence to substantiate this extravagant panegyric.

The date of the death of Ariyanātha is 1600, according to Nelson. Mr. Rangachari's estimate of the duration of his power and his date for his death do not seem to be quite consistent. At first he says: 'For more than *half a century* after Viśvanātha's death (which occurred in 1563, according to him) . . . 'he (Ariyanātha) was the pilot of the infant kingdom.'[6] This statement puts the death of Ariyanātha

1 p. 107.
2 *I.A.*, 1916, p. 102.
3 *Ibid.*, p. 101.
4 *Ibid.*, p. 102.
5 *O.H. MSS.*, ii, p. 112.
6 *I.A.*, 1915, pp. 62,3.

after 1613. Later on : 'But Āryanātha's labours were not destined to end as Viśvanātha's lieutenant and minister. He was destined to hold that power for the next 40 *years*'.[7] Accordingly Ariyanātha must have died in 1603. Finally: 'For more than 38 *years* he had been the life of the young state, and given it glory and success.' 'In 1600 he felt the effects of age and toil, and succumbed to death.'[8] It is very hard to understand the process by which Mr. Rangachari managed to come to this final conclusion, on the basis of the irreconcilable statements quoted above.

With regard to the age of Ariyanātha at the time of his death, Mr. Rangachari similarly changes his position. In the beginning, the says that he was born 'somewhere in the 2nd or 3rd decade of he 10th century' and that he 'must have been about 20 years younger than Viśvanātha'.[9] Further on, he remarks that, in 1595, he was 'more than 80'.[10] If Mr. Rangachari is not sure whether Ariyanātha was born in the second or the third decade of the sixteenth century, he could hardly be more than eighty in 1595 as he asserts. If he stands by the latter statement, Ariyanātha's birth could not have been later than at least 1515, and the alternative of the third decade has to go. According to Mr. Rangachari, Viśvanātha was 'born in the beginning of the 16th century or a decade before'.[11] Taking only 1500 for Viśvanātha's birth, Ariyanātha's birth would be in 1520, and in 1595 he would be only seventy-five, and not 'more than 80'. Mr. Rangachari does not state his authority for all these conjectures, and only his assertion stands that Ariyanātha was more than eighty in 1595. If so, he must have been at least eighty-five at the time ascribed for his death.

We shall take Mr. Rangachari's final date for Ariyanātha's death as 1600 and examine its probability. It is apparently based on Taylor's translation of a *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscript*[12] which says that Ariyanātha died on the 7th Chittirai, *Śārvari*, and 'held the united offices of minister and generalissimo during four reigns, or thirty-eight years and nine months'. The original of this translation[13] gives the

[7] *Ibid.*, 1916, p. 81.

[8] *Ibid.*' p. 102.

[9] *Ibid.*, 1915, p. 63.

[10] *Ibid.*, 1986, p. 101.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 75

[12] *O.H. MSS.*, ii, p. 119

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

date as 7th Chittirai, *Sarvadhāri*, which is 19th April, 1588, approximately. There are only two inscriptions which refer to Ariyanātha; one of 1560[14] and another of 1570, where he, along with two others, is described as the agent of Viśvanātha Nāyaka, Krishṇappa Nāyaka and Vīrappa Nāyaka.[15] But there is not sufficient evidence to arrive at a definite conclusion regarding his age and date of death. Therefore the date 1600 for the event can be accepted only provisionally, if at all. There seems to be no valid ground for supposing that he was twenty years younger than Viśvanātha ; on the contrary, it is likely that he was a little older. The *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscript* on his life says that he took Viśvanātha with him to the south. Considering the difficulties of his task, it is probable that the latter was given an elderly adviser. If so, Ariyanātha must have lived to a ripe old age.

Krishṇappa Nāyaka appears prominently in the inscriptions of the period. He is described as 'sitting on the lion-throne of Vallabha Narēndra' in a record of 1596,[16] and as the 'Pāṇḍya Pārthiva Krishṇa Nṛpatih' (King Krishṇa, the Pāṇḍya king) in 1597.[17] It was he who was responsible for the Veḷḷanguḍi Plates of Venkaṭa I, dated 1598, and the Padmanēri copper plates of the same year.[18] In an inscription of 1600[19] his agent is mentioned. Thus his epigraphical records range between 1596 and 1600, and he was all in all throughout his reign. Mr.Rangachari admits that nothing is known about his elder brother and co-ruler, 'Viśvanātha III'.

The Vijayanagar emperor, Venkaṭa I, is recognized as the paramount sovereign by Krisnṇappa Nāyaka[20] and by the Pāṇḍyas.[21] A few records of the former make his position clear ; these are his copper plate grant of 1597 at the request of Krishṇappa Nāyaka[22] and his Veḷḷanguḍi Plates of 1598. Venkaṭa I had thus sufficient control over both the Nāyaks and their subordinates, the Pāṇḍyas ; and the latter were loyal to him. The inscriptions of the Pāṇḍyas show that their power was gradually increasing under the Nāyaks. Further, the grant of villages in the Tiruvaḍi*rājya*[23] indicates that the con-

14 Appendix D, No. 49.
15 *Ibid.*, No. 66.
16 *Ibid.*, No. 92.
17 Appendix D, No. 94.
18 *Ibid*, Nos. 96 and 97.
19 *Ibid.*, No. 98.
20 *Ibid.*, No. 97
21 *Ibid.*, No. 90.
22 *Ibid.*, No. 94.
23 Vdḷḷanguḍi Plates and Padmaneaai inscription of 1598.

quered territory of Travancore remained intact, and the Tiruvaḍi was at least not aggressive. Krishṇappa Nāyaka's position with regard to the Pāṇḍyas and Travancore was secure and his loyalty to the emperor beyond question.

His death.—After a short reign of about five years and nine months, Krishṇappa Nāyaka died in Vaikāśi, Plava (May-June, 1601), according to the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts*. The *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle* gives the period of his reign as seven years, from Mārgaḷi, Manmatha, to Chittirai, Plava; but this comes to only about five years and four months. There is consistency between the dates and the total period in the case of the former. However, there is not much difference between the two with regard to the final date of the reign. Further, there is no conflict with inscriptions, the last one for Krishṇappa belonging to 1600.

CHAPTER VI

MUTTU KRISHṆAPPA NĀYAKA

(1601—1609)

On the death of Krishṇappa Nāyaka II, the throne is said to have been usurped by his youngest brother, Kastūri Ranga, the other brother Viśvappa having predeceased him. Within the course of about a week the usurper is said to have been murdered in the *Sandyamanḍapa*, probably as an expression of populnr protest against his action, and Muttu Krishṇappa crowned. This latter is not mentioned by the *Pānḍyan Chronicle* and by one *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscript*[1]; but it is clear from the other chronicles, inscriptions, and a few coins, that he came to the throne some time after the death of Krishṇappa Nāyaka II.

Nelson and Mr. Rangachari, following some chronicles, consider Muttu Krishṇappa as the son of Krishṇappa Nāyaka II. But a *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscript*[2] and the *Maduraittalavaralāṟu* say that he was the son of Viśvappa, the younger brother of Krishṇappa Nāyaka II. This view is confirmed by the Kūniyūr Plates of Venkaṭa II, which give the genealogy of the Nāyaks upto Tirumala Nāyaka. Hence it is to be taken that Muttu Krishṇappa was the son of Viśvappa, the second son of Vīrappa Nāyaka.

Organization of the Marava Country.—The most important event of Muttu Krishṇappa's reign was the effective organization of the Marava country under the Sētupatis. Whether the Sētupatis were established or restored is immaterial to our present purpose, but it is highly probable that they were the vassals of the Pānḍyas before. Nelson says: 'It seems probable that in the time of Muttu Krishṇappa, the Ramnad country . . . was under the management of two Commissioners appointed by the Governor of Madura.'[3] Mr. Rangachari thinks that this experiment may have been made by Viśvanātha, the founder of the Nāyak dynasty, and asserts that it was a

1 Taylor, *O. H. MSS.*, vol. ii, p. 119.
2 *Ibid.*, p. 260.
3 p. 109.

success till 1600. It was only after this year that the Ramnad country fell into anarchy. He attempts to shield Viśvanātha and Ariyanātha, his heroes, from any charge of neglect of the Marava country.[4] But Nelson speaks of the unqualified failure of the commission. Perhaps Muttu Krishṇappa himself, or one of his immediate predecessors, tried that plan. In any case, final organization of the country was the work of Muttu Krishṇappa.

The Nāyaks, in general, seem to have left the coast region open to the enterprise of foreign nations.[5] In the sixteenth century this policy of the open door remained unaltered. Gradually, however,

[4] *I. A.*, 1916, p. 105.

[5] The position of the Nāyaks in regard to foreigners trading along the coast country was probably a mere continuation of the policy pursued by the Pāṇḍyas. There are good reasons for believing that with the great Cholas the overseas enterprise of the Tamils came to an end and gradually gave place to Arab enterprise which ultimately superseded all Tamil effort in this direction both on the coast and in the Archipelago. Under the last great Paṇḍya, Kulaśēkhara, the agent of the horse-trading Jamal-ud-Din, Governor of Shiraz, held the chief place in this region. He occupied, according to the Muhammadan historians, a high place even in the councils of the Pāndya. This position of the agent of the Muhammadan trader at Kāyal is in striking contrast to the position that the foreigners occupied under the great Cholas, as is exemplified in the case of the mere building of a Buddhist Vihāra and making grants of lands to it by the rulers of Kadāram under the great Cholas. The rulers of Kaḍāram (Śrī Bhōja ar Palambang) had to obtain permission in both cases by sending out special missions and obtaining the requisite license through the intervention of the foreign secretary of the Cholas. That state of things had completely vanished under the Pāṇḍyas. The conquest of the Pāṇḍya country by Vijayanagar does not appear to have provided for this immediately, as in all probability this conquest did not involve the acquisition of all the coast territory by the new empire. It is in connection with the appointment of Lakkaṇa, the chief Daṇṇāyak at headquarters, as a 'Special Commissioner for the South', that the first effort at bringing the coast region under the control of the provincial government comes into view. Lakkaṇa had the combined title of Viceroy of Madura and 'Lord of the Southern Ocean'. 'This Lordship of the Southern Ocean' seems to imply control over the ports and, to a certain extent, command of the overseas trade. In the period of usurpation an effort was made to bring the Pāṇḍyas under control chiefly through the efforts of *Narasa Nāyaka*, the father of the great king *Krishṇadēva Rāya*. That probably meant a more thorough conquest of the whole region and its reduction to a position of subordination to the empire as a means of extending the imperial authority down to the coast, as it was about that time when the Portuguese made their first appearance on the west coast. The enterprise of foreigners on the coast assumed a more definite shape and showed aggressive features under Vasco da Gama and Albuquerque. The dissatisfaction expressed by the latter in regard to the reception given to his agent, Fra. Luiz, immediately after the fall of Goa is evidence of the cautious imperial policy of Krishṇadēva Rāya. His subsequent transactions with the Portuguese showed a spirit friendly to their commercial enterprise; but he was equally clear in discountenancing the more aggressive enterprise of the Portuguese aganinst the coast power, as in the case of Zamorin of Calicut, against whom

the establishment of an independent authority, at the back of their dominions, was felt by the Nāyaks to be prejudicial to their interests. The following remarks of Bishop Caldwell[6] explain the situation created by the policy of indifference towards the coast region which the Nāyaks followed in the beginning: 'Xavier . . . speaks of the Paravas as "subjects of His Portuguese Majesty" . . . The entire civil and criminal jurisdiction of the fishery coast had been seized upon by the Portuguese, and . . . all dues and taxes, including the valuable revenue arising from the pearl-fishery, had been assumed by the governors appointed by the Portuguese Viceroy. The Portuguese had not asked any native potentate's consent to the formation of their settlements'. Thus political disruption and financial spoliation seem to have followed in the wake of commercial and religious penetration. It was probably to counteract these hostile influences of foreigners that Muttu Krishṇappa established a strong government in the Marava country.

These political and financial motives seem to have been the chief cause of the revival of the Sētupatis. A religious purpose was not wanting. The whole Marava country was in a chaos of disorder and insecurity, and consequently the way to Rāmēśvaram, to which pil-

Albuquerque sought an alliance with the Rāya. Krishṇa gave no reply to this, indicating clearly that he did not favour that kind of enterprise. The coming of Francis Xavier to the Parava coast, combined with various others of the doings of the Portuguese on the west coast, indicated the character of the peaceful penetration of the Portuguese missionaries actively supported by the Portuguese civil government. It was the advent of this new influence that called for more drastic action on the part of the empire, the so-called invasion of the *Baḍages* against which Portuguese writers bitterly complain. It was no more than a drastic effort made to assert imperial authority, and explains the constant vigilance and active enterprise of Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala and his brother Timma in the south for a period almost of ten years. The adoption of Christianity by the Paravas was held to imply a change of fealty from the Indian government to the king of Portugal, and that naturally would have provoked drastic measures for the assertion of Vijayanagar authority. Viśvanātha's subordinate position during this period of Rāmaraja Viṭṭhala's activity in the south finds an explanation in this as also the immediately preceding effort to extend Travancore authority across the whole peninsula to the east coast. This reassertion of imperial authority seems to have been in the main successful and help good so long as the empire lasted. After the battle of Talikota, the peaceful efforts of the missionaries, chiefly Jesuits, combined with the enlightened policy of toleration pursued by the emperors gradually enabled them to gain lost ground and even renew their aggressive activity which involved the change of political allegiance. It is this undercurrent of political activity of the missionaries that brought the native powers down upon them in India, as in the famous persecutions of Christians in the Roman empire during the early centuries of the Christian era.—*Ed.*

6 *History of Tinnevelly*, p. 71.

grims flocked, was rendered unsafe. The date of this event is said in a *Makenzie Manuscript*[7] to be 1605. This is likely to be correct, as the first Sētupati inscription of this period belongs to 1607.

The actual circumstances leading to the restoration of the Sētupatis are described by the chronicles in their own way. As is usual with Mr. Rangachari, he does not neglect to cram into his history all the romantic literature on the subject; he is very careful not to omit even stories of 'doubtful veracity' and 'absurd and inaccurate' versions of events, in his own terminology. Readers, eager for the strange and the curious, may find much mental pabulum in his elaborate narratives and lengthy extracts. What is clear from the account of the chronicles is that Muttu Krishṇappa made Śaḍaika Tēva, Uḍaiyān Sētupati, only after testing his capacity to deal effectively with the situation in the Marava country. It seems that the latter was allowed a free hand on agreeing to pay a fixed tribute. At first he appears to have made the passage to Rāmēśvaram safe by fortifying Ramnad and Pōgalūr, and arranging escorts for the pilgrims. The turbulent chiefs in the surrounding country were subdued and a strong government established at Kāḷaiyārkōvil, Paṭṭamangalam, and other places, most probably by Śaḍaika Tēva or Daḷavāy Sētupati, though all this is attributed to his son, Kūttan Sētupati, by the *History of the Carnataca Governors*.

Daḷavāy Sētupati's inscriptions at Rāmēśvaram record his gifts to the temple; these are a grant of five villages in 1607, and another grant of eight villages in 1608. A copper plate record of 1608 refers to a grant of lands to the temple servants.[8] He seems to have been a successful ruler who did much for peace and progress by clearing forests and encouraging cultivation. It is likely that he ruled till 1623, as the *Mackenzie Manuscript*, referred to above, says, and was succeeded by his son, Kūttan Sētupati; for the latter's first inscription[9] is dated 21st Māśi, Rudhirōdgāri (the beginning of March, 1624).

Christianity and Robert de Nobili.—We have seen how the Madura Mission was established towards the close of the reign of Vīrappa Nāyaka, and how the first attempts at conversion failed to cope with the insuperable obstacles to success. Still Fernandez continued his futile policy with much perseverance till 1606, when new developments in missionary activity overwhelmed his work. In the reign of

[7] Taylor, *O. H. MSS.*, ii, Appendix, p. 49.
[8] Appendix D, No. 105, 109 and 106.
[9] *Ibid.*, No. 122.

Muttu Krishṇappa a most thorough-going scheme of conversion to Christianiy, which owed its inception and execution to Robert de Nobili, was worked out. This great experiment of de Nobili and the work of his successors in the Madura Mission are important chapters in the history of Christianity in India. Though they have been elaborately deat with by scholars best fitted to handle them, they are yet subjects of controversy, because much partisanship inevitably enters into questions of religion and religious history. The works of J.Hough (*History of Christianity in India)* and J.W. Kaye (*Christianity in India*) are charged with much passion and vehemence, exhibiting an utter want of 'sympathy' with the subject: and, therefore, they are of doubtful value. The Rev. J. S. Chandler (*The Jesuit Mission in Madura)* handles the subject more soberly. We are at present directly concerned only with the political influences and results of missionary activities.

De Nobili seems to have formed a general plan of his work in India, even before leaving Europe. He is said to have declared like St. Paul: 'I will make myself Indian to save the Indians.'[10] Herein lay the germs of his policy of Indianizing Christianity. By birth an Italian, connected with the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Europe, he was endowed with a towering personality and a penetrating intellect. He came to Madura in December, 1606, and his uninterrupted 'meditation' was perhaps on the details of his plan of campaign. He had already analysed the causes of his predecessor's failure, and he scrpulously avoided the impression of a *Parangi* by a careful regulation of his dress and diet. He openly dissociated himself from Fernandez proclaiming that he (de Nobili) was a 'Roman Brahman'. His daring and original plan consisted mainly of three features, viz. 'the adaptation of the life of the missionary to that of the people' (the Brahmans), the appropriation of harmless (Hindu) customs and ceremonies for Christian use', and 'the thorough study of the vernaculars (and Sanskrit, the language of the sacred books of Hinduism) with a view to fluency of speech and writing, and accurate knowledge of the literature of the people.'[11] In all these three items, he initiated a departure from old and accepted methods of proselytism.

Soon after he began his work, he made some conversions of high-placed people, and his fame spread throughout the country. It is said that even the Nāyak desired an interview with him, which was,

10 Bertrand, ii, p. 3.

11 J. S. Chandler, *The Jesuit Mission in Madura*, p. 35.

however, cleverly refused. This initial success naturally created some flutterings in orthodox circles, but the influence of 'Hermécatti' (Erumaikaṭṭi), a Polegar, prevented a crisis. On the 15th of January, 1609, de Nobili wrote: 'The tempest of the Brahmans has passed.' (Bertrand, ii, p. 26). Thus the reign of Muttu Krishṇappa saw the beginnings of Nobili's endeavours in the cause of Christianity.

Muttu Krishṇappa's attitude towards the Vijayanagar Emperor.—There are only a few inscriptions of Muttu Krishṇappa's reign which indicate his attitude towards Venkaṭa I, the Vijayanagar emperor. Two records of the latter, dated 1602 and 1604, prove his authority in the Nāyak dominions.[12] There is only one inscription referring to Muttu Krishṇappa during his reign.[13] His copper coins apparently prove his loyalty to the emperor; on the obverse, there is the legend 'Tiruvēṁga(ḷa)' and on the reverse 'Mudu-Krishṇa'.[14] There are other coins of the Nāyaks,[15] according to Hultzsch (Elliot Collection No. 177), which mention 'Veṁkaṭapa' on the reverse, and contain the fish-emblem, and are found in large numbers in the bazaars of Madura. But there is no clear evidence that they belong to Muttu Krishṇappa. But Mr. Rangachari thinks it is 'practically certain' that they are his coins, because they are of the same type as the former.[16]

Throughout his reign Muttu Krishṇappa was engaged in the peaceful work of orderly administration. His arrangements for the settlement of the Marava country constituted a move in the right direction, though, in the long run, the existence of a strong chieftaincy near Madura was not an unmixed good. On occasions of vital emergency and crisis, as we shall see, it sometimes rallied to the cause of the kingdom. Muttu Krishṇappa's dealings with the missionaries

[12] Appendix D, Nos. 99 and 101.

[13] *Ibid.*, No. 104.

[14] The obverse legend of this coin, Tiruvēṁga(ḷa), may have no connection with the name of the king Venkaṭa. It may stand for the patron god of the Madura Nāyaks, as the particular form of Vishṇu to which they were devoted. It will be remembered that Krishṇappa Nāyaka installed this form of god Vishṇu in the temple he constructed in the new town Krishṇāpuram founded by him. If that should turn out to be so, this would be something like an effort at independnce, but it is hardly a necessary inference in the face of the statement of Caesar Frederick, who says that each provincial governor issued copper coins of his own so that the traveller had to take fresh change almost every day that he travelled.—*Ed.*

I.A., 1891, p. 308, No. 38.

[15] *I.A.*, 1891, p. 308, No. 37.

[16] *I.A.*, 1916, p. 104.

reveal his broad-minded toleration and appreciation of honest effort, provided it did not go against the stability of the kingdom. A weak man, feeling the insecurity of his position, would not have given room for such activities. His control over the coasts is clear from Caldwell's references,[17] and from the letter of Albert Laerzio, dated November 20, 1609, where the Paravas are described as the tributaries of the king of Madura and the latter as the ally of the Portuguese.[18] His gift of lands to the Bhagavatī temple at Cape Comorin and 'other evidence' clearly show that the Madura Nāyak had complete control over the Comorin Coast.[19] Further, Muttu Krishṇappa's resources were devoted to objects of popular approval, as the building of *Pagoḍas*, grant of *agrahāras*, and construction of tanks. He is also said to have built a town called Krishṇāpuram between Madura and Skandamalai, and a Śiva temple at Kayattūr.

His death.—The only real guide to the date of Muttu Krishṇappa's death seems to be an inscription of his successor, Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka, dated Kīlaka,[20] which places the latest limit of this event in April, 1609. Nelson and Mr. Rangachari give the same year, though they fail to mention on what authority their view is based. It is worth of note, however, that Laerzio's letter of November 20, 1609, does not refer to the death of Muttu Krishṇappa.

Muttu Krishṇappa left three sons, Muttu Vīrappa, Tirumala, and Kumāra Muttu, according to the *History of the Carnataca Governors* and some *Mackenzie Manuscripts*. But the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts* and the *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle* do not mention Kumāra Muttu. The Kūniyūr Plates of Venkaṭa II say that Muttu Krishṇa had two sons, Muttu Vīra and Tirumala There seems to be no reference in any other inscriptions to a younger brother of Tirumala, but they mention a Kumāra Muttu Tirumala as the son of Tirumala Nāyaka. Therefore, that Muttu Krishṇappa had a third son cannot be accepted without further evidence.

17 *History of Tinnevelly*, pp. 71-2.

18 Bertrand, ii, p. 2.

19 V. Nagam Aiya, *The Travancore State Manual*, i, p. 302; Appendix D, No. 102.

20 Appendix D, No. 110.

CHAPTER VII

MUTTU VĪRAPPA NĀYAKA I

(1609–c.1623)

Muttu Vīrappa succeeded his father early in 1609. The most important question to examine in his reign is his attitude towards the Vijayanagar empire. Mr. Rangachari takes it that his loyalty is beyond doubt. In support of his opinion, he cites a copper-plate grant of 1609,[1] issued by Venkaṭa I at the request of Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka. This proves nothing to the point, as it was at the very commencent of his reign. Another inscription he refers to is the damaged record of a Venkaṭadēva Mahārāja, making a gift for the merit of Vīrappa Nāyaka in 1617.[2] But Venkaṭa I died in 1614. Mr. Rangachari says 'even if he was a relation of the imperial family, that inscription is an evidence in favour of Vīrappa's vassalage.[3] This assumes the point to be proved, viz., the existence of a Venkaṭadēva in the imperial royal family 1617. A third inscription, adduced by Mr. Rangachari to prove his contention, is a copper-plate charter of 1620.[4] This record from the Coimbatore district is a grant by a Raghunātha Mahārāja, the son of Śrī Venkaṭadēva Mahārāja of Uraiyūr, the agent of Viśvanātha-Vīrappa Nāyaka and feudatory of Vīra Rāmadēva, then ruling at Penukoṇḍa. As it refers to unknown mahahārājas of Uraiyūr, it is a very flimsy basis to support Muttu Vīrappa's loyalty to the empire.[5]

Other sources of information tend to show that Muttu Vīrapa Nāyaka, far from being loyal to his soverign, aimed at making him-

[1] Appendix D, No. 111.

[2] *Ibid.*, No. 119.

[3] *I.A.*, 1916, p. 133, *n.*

[4] Appendix D, No. 120

[5] The mahārājas of Uraiyūr, mentioned in this record, may after all be a family of petty chiefs or *jaghirdars* whose headquarters had been at Uraiyūr. The mention of Vīra Kāmadēva as ruling at Penukoṇḍa is evidence of the donor's loyalty to the empire, as, at the date 1620, the young prince Rāma, who escaped massacre, was actually the ruler of Vijayangar. It will be remembered that it was in support of this prince that Raghunātha Nāyaka of Tanjore fought the battle of Toppūr against a coalition of other governors under the leadership of the Nāyak of Madura.—*Ed.*

self independent of imperial control. Vico, in his letter of the 30th of August, 1611, remarks that he was irregular in the payment of tribute, and would never pay it willingly.[6] In the letter of Proenza, dated 1659, it is said that Tirumala Nāyaka only continued his predecessor's policy of separation from the Vijayanagar empire.[7] Barradas informs us that the Nāyak of Madura joined Jagga Rāya, the unscrupulous traitor, in the imperial war of succession that followed the death of Venkata I, and that it was his help that prolonged that struggle. Mr. Rangachari thinks that Muttu Vīrappa may have honestly believed that the defeated party of Jagga Rāya was in the right; but such a hypothesis, in the face of the plain facts, must be proved before it can be accepted as Vīrappa's inscriptions from 1610 to 1623 give a strong negative proof of his disregard of the imperial connection.[8] They mention only Muttu Vīrappa though some of them were issued by him, and have nothing to say about the Vijayanagar emperor. It is highly probable that the former took advantage of the empire's troublous days, consequent on the death of Venkaṭa I.[9]

6 Brtrand, ii, p. 124: *vide* Appendix A, Letter

7 *Ibid.*, iii, p. 42: *vide ibid.*, Letter No. 1.

8 Appendix D, Nos. 112, 114, 115, 116, 118, 123, 124.

9 On the question of Muttu Vīrappa's hostility to the empire there can be no doubt. Ever since the battle of Talikota and the consequent removal of the capital of the empire from Vijayanagar to Penukoṇḍa, the province of Madura had showed a tendency to break off from the imperial connection, at any ra te, to disregard it, as the empire was not conveniently placed to enforce its authority. After the first years of reconstruction emperor Tirumala was able to rehabilitate his position to a great extent, and Krishṇappa Nāyaka I, his contemporary, seems to have maintained the form, at any rate, of loyalty. It is this doubtful allegiance of the distant province of Madura, and possibly a similar attitude on the part of the viceroys of Śrīraṅgapaṭṭaṇam, that led to the particular arrangement in regard to the government of the empire on the death of Tirumala. According to Tirumala Aiyangar, the minister of Chikkadēva Rāya of Mysore, the empire was put in commission, as it were. The three sons of Tirumala succeeded to the government as a whole; the eldest surviving one, Śrīranga, had the general control over the empire and occupied the throne. The next younger brother, Rāma, was given the viceroyalty of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam and made that his headquarters. Venkaṭapati, the last of the brothers, had his headquarters in Chandragiri and was a sort of over-governor of the provinces of what were the Tuṇḍīra, Chola and Pāṇḍya kingdoms, that is all the Tamil country. Rather late in the reign of Vīrappa Nāyaka an attempt seems to have been made to overthrow the imperial authority, as this same account says that when Śrīranga died childless and probably predeceased by Rāma, Venkaṭapati succeeded to the empire and almost the first act of his reign was the suppression of a rebellion in Madura, for which he deputed his first nephew, Tirumala, the eldest son of Rāma, whose treason to the empire has already been referred to. It was subsequently that Venkaṭapati led an invasion himself and brought Vīrappa back to a sense of loyalty to the empire. In this campaign Tanjore seems to have stood loyally by Venkaṭa, and the battle of Vallamprākāra, referred to in the Pudukottai Plates, has

A Jesuit letter of 12th June, 1610 says that 'Hermècatti (Erumaikaṭṭi) Nāyaka...distinguished himself by his bravery, took some fortress by assault and returned victorious from the war. The great Nāyak loaded him with honours and new favours'.[10] Another letter of 25th November, 1611,[11] refers to a war between the Nāyaks of Madura and Tanjore. It is not known what caused it, and how it was brought to a close. This seems to be different from the war of 1616.

The death of the Vijayanagar emperor Venkaṭa I in 1614 led to a tragic civil war between the loyal adherents of the legal claimant to the throne, headed by Yāchama Nāyaka, and the supporters of the putative son of Venkaṭa under the leadership of Jagga Rāya. Foiled in the north by the loyalist party, Jagga came to the south to join the opposition of Madura and Gingi against loyalist Tanjore. Muttu Vīrappa of Madura and the Nāyak of Gingi had already espoused his cause, and Ragunātha, the Nāyak of Tanjore, was the mainstay of the imperialist party of Yāchama Nāyaka. The contest, which took place at Trichinopoly, was not over in December, 1616, when Barradas wrote his account. The *Sāhityaratnākaram* and the *Raghunāthābhyudayam* refer to this war, and claim the victory for Tanjore; the latter speaks of the complete defeat of Jagga Rāya and the Madura Nāyak, and the former says that the Nāyak of Madura destroyed the stone dam across the Kaveri, and that the hostilities came to an end by the marriage of his daughter with Raghunātha Nāyaka.§ Therefore the imperial cause seems to have triumphed for the time.

The Pudukottai Plates of Śrī Vallabha and Varatunga Pāṇdya, dated 1583,[12] describe a battle at Vallamprākāra (Vallam) between the armies of Venkaṭa Rāja (Venkaṭa I) and Vīra Rāja (Vīrappa Nāyaka), in which the latter's forces were destroyed and those of Achyuta Rāja (Achyutappa Nāyaka) fled away. If this is a reference to the war of succession, faught in the south in 1616, the date of the inscription will have to be revised. But there was no Venkaṭa at that

reference to this engagement. The Nāyaks of Madura seem to have forgiven neither the emperor for this assertion of authority nor the Nāyaks of Tanjore for the loyal support that made this assertion possible. This general hostility to the empire accounts for much that remains otherwise inexplicable in the foreign policy of the Madura Nāyaks.—*Ed.*

10 Bertrand, ii, p. 88.

11 *Ibid.*, p. 108.

§ S.K.A. *Sources*, pp. 255, 260, 265, 270, 272-4, 289-90.

12 *T.A.S.*, i, pp. 61-88.

time, and Achyutappa Nāyaka had already abdicated. Perhaps the expression 'armies of Venkaṭa Rāja' was loosely used for the forces of the loyalist party and of Raghunātha Nāyaka. If the date is correct, it is difficult to explain such a combination of contending parties in 1583 or before. It is said that this inscription was issued by Ativīrarāma's brother, presumably after his death. But Mr. Krishna Sastri identifies Śrī Vallabha with Ativīrarāma Pāṇḍya, and Dr. Burnell refers to a copper-plate grant that puts the latter's death in 1610. Even then, it is hard to understand how an inscription of Ativīrarāma could refer to the events of 1616. Therefore nothing definite can be said about the value of this inscription in relation to the war of succession of 1616.[13]

[13] The invasion of Madura, referred to in the previous note, by Venkaṭapati Rāya must have taken place soon after 1586. The war between Tanjore and Madura, referred to in the Jesuit letters of 1610 and 1611, must be one in which the empire government had taken no part, probably because it was involved in one of those periodical struggles against the aggressions of the Muhammadans from the north. It was in the year 1610 that Rāja Uḍaiyār was able to lay siege to, and take possession of, Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam from viceroy Tirumala without imperial intervention. This action on the part of Rāja Uḍaiyār received imperial confirmation in 1612. This ratification of what might be construed as an act of war against the empire was probably owing to the difficulties in which the empire was involved at the time, and the same difficulties would explain any restiveness on the part of Madura about the same period. The actual difficulties of the empire are found clearly stated in the *Sāhityaratnākaram* and *Raghunāthābhyudayam*, both of which relate to the history of the Nāyaks of Tanjore, particularly Raghunātha Nāyaka. The emperor Venkaṭapati, who was not without a will to enforce his authority upon the provinces of the empire, was then involved in a war caused by the invasion of the imperial territories by the Muhammadans of Golkonda and culminating in a siege of Penukoṇḍa. At this time, the emperor obtained the assistance of young Raghunātha from his father, Achyutappa Nāyaka of Tanjore. Raghunātha is credited with having beaten back the Muhammadans from siege of Penukoṇḍa and given the emperor much-needed relief. He is said to have then obtained as a favour from the emperor the release from prison of Krishṇappa Nāyaka of Gingi, who had been thrown into it by Venkaṭapati as punishment for an act of treason. The same situation probably constituted the influencing motive for Venkaṭapati Rāya, who not only looked on with equanimity at the overthrow of his nephew in Srīrangapaṭṭaṇam by a feudatory of his, but actually accorded imperial sanction to the transfer of the viceroyalty of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam from the recalcitrant nephew to a possibly loyal feudatory. The siege of Penukoṇḍa therefore may have taken place in 1611 or 1612, and Raghunātha must have returned to Tanjore in the same year or the year following. Venkaṭapati died two years after, in 1614, and was succeeded by Srīranga Chikkarāya, the nephew of Venkaṭapati and younger brother of the late viceroy Tirumala of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam. It was this nomination by Venkaṭa of his nephew that brought about the war of succession, Jagga Rāya setting up a putative son of his sister, one of the queens of Venkaṭa. Failing in his efforts to prevent the accession of Srīranga Chikkarāya to the empire, Jagga Rāya wreaked his vengeance by massacring the whole of the royal family. But a loyal chieftain, Yāchama Nāyaka, managed to save by a stratagem one of the young princes, Rāma by name. Yāchama cut through the enemy's lines and escaped with the

Change of Capital.—The choronicles say nothing about Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka's transfer of capital from Madura to Trichinopoly, though they speak of Tirumala Nāyaka as ruling from the latter place at the commencement of his reign. In Guerreo's *Relation* the Nāyak is said to be holding his court in Madura in 1604.[14] Léon Besse,[15] probably basing himself on Jesuit records, says that 'the Nāyak of Madura removed his court and army to Trichinopoly in 1616 with the object of making war with the king of Tanjore'. This conclusion may be accepted.[16]

prince to the protection of the loyal viceroy of Tanjore. Jagga Rāya also moved southward rapidly to prevent the fugitive prince and general from successfully effecting their escape into Tanjore. The prince and his protector were met at Kumbakonam by Raghunātha and were taken in safety to Tanjore. At the time that Jagga arrived near the island of Śrīrangam, the Nāyak of Gingi, and the Nāyak of Madura with his accessory Portuguese contingent and even troops from Travancore, his feudatory Pāndyas, and, in fact, all the feudatories of the empire were ready to join him as the result of a previously organized effort. Tanjore stood loyal: Mysore does not appear to have interfered for the obvious reason that the acquisition of Srīrangapaṭṭaṇam was too recent, and Rāja Uḍaiyār had reason to be grateful to the late emperor for the conferment of the viceroyalty upon him. In any case, there was no reason whatsoever for Mysore to join in this combination, and there was valid reason against Rāja Uḍaiyār's doing so. All these transactions would have taken time, and the battle at Toppūr, which was the result of the machinations of the feudatories, could not have taken place before 1616. A detailed account of this battle is embodied in a report submitted by one of the subordinates of Raghunātha, and this report is dated the month of Āshāḍha, in the cyclic year Naḷa: it would be some date in August-September of 1616-17. This report is embodied in the Telugu work *Raghunāthābhyudayam* by his son and successor, Vijayarāghava of Tanjore. It is clear from this that the battle of Vallamprākāra, referred to in the Pudukottai Plates (of date 1582-3), cannot be taken to refer to the battle of Toppūr. In the battle of Toppūr Venkaṭa or Vīrappa Nāyaka of Madura or Achyuta of Tanjore, could none of them have taken part. The only difficulty in regard to this date (1582-3) is that, at that date or before it Venkaṭa was not the emperor, but he was as good as that, as the superior viceroy of the three governorships in the Tuṇḍīra, Chola, and Pāṇḍya countries. He may have intervened in the war as regent of the emperor, Śrīranga, and in his own name as a superior viceroy. This is more than probable as his elder brother Śrīranga was a prisoner in the hands of the Golkonda general in the year 1579-80—*Ed.*

14 Caldwell, *History of Tinnevelly*, p. 71.

15 *La Mission du Maduré*, p. 3.

16 The change of capital from Madura to Trichinopoly seems to have been the direct result of the combination that culminated in the battle of Toppūr. Léon Besse's statement that this took place in 1616 seems to be founded on fact. By 1616 the hostility between Madura and Tanjore had settled into a habitual kind of relation between the two Nāyakships. The aggressions of the Muhammadans made the difficulties of Venkaṭa's last years of rule so great as to make him more or less acquiesce in the achievement of practical independence by Rāja Uḍaiyār of Mysore. This example must have made a similar effort on the part of the other viceroys of the empire quite normal. The massacre of the royal family and the consequent unequal division of the empire into two camps of loyalists and

Relations with the Pāṇḍyas.—If the Pudukoṭṭai Plates of Śrī Vallabha and Varatunga Pāṇḍya belong to the reign of Muttu Vīrappa, it is clear that the Pāṇḍyas co-operated with him in his war with Tanjore. Caldwell[17] considers Ativīrarama Pāṇḍya as the last of the later Pāṇḍyas, and he must have died at the latest by 1610; but Dr. Burnell refers to a Sundara Pāṇḍya, his successor, and a record of his in his thirteenth year, i.e., 1622. There are practically no reliable inscriptional records of the Pāṇḍyas from the time of Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka. The late Mr. T.A. Gopinatha Rao gives a list of the Pāṇḍyas, which goes to 1753.[18] A Jesuit letter of 1666 refers to the extinction, long ago, of the kingdom of Tenkāśi.[19]. It is not clear whether there were any real Pāṇḍya rulers after the reign of Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka.

On the whole, the Pāṇḍyas seem to have been loyal to the Nāyakas of Madura. The boast of Muttu Krishna and Muttu Vīra that they conquered the 'Panchar' (Paṇḍyas) was perhaps only a reflection of Visvānātha's conquest of them.[20] The early Nāyaks after Visvanātha do not seem to have undertaken any military action against them. They did not, probably, interfere much with their internal administration, but they seem to have insisted only on tribute, and military help when required. This quasi-independent status was allowed to them, perhaps to check possible aggression from

'rebels', of the latter of whom the Nāyak of Madura was the acknowledged leader, made it necessary for him to take more vigorous and permanent steps to safeguard himself against loyalist Tanjore. The great military object of the combination before the battle of Toppūr was to prevent the fugitive prince from getting into Tanjore. Jagga seems to have placed himself along the road leading from Tiruvaṇṇāmalai or Gingi into Trichinopoly. The road through Mysore was for obvious reasons not feasible for Yācha and his ward, the fugitive prince. They apparently took the coast road: Raghunātha's advancing to Kumbakonam to meet them is a clear indication of this. Trichinopoly therefore would be the most desirable salient for the purpose of this combination. After the victory of Toppūr the hostility of Tanjore would have been all the greater and perhaps even more aggressive, as she must have gained in prestige by being loyalist in her activities. By dislodging the Portuguese from Negapatam, by destroying the den of the Sōḷaga chieftain at Dēvikōṭṭa at the mouth of the Coleroon, and by defeating the disloyal combination against the empire, Tanjore must have gained immensely in prestige and power. So far, there were no signs of hostility from Mysore and Trichinopoly was, from the point of view of the strategist no less than from political considerations, the better placed for the capital of the great viceroyalty of the South.—*Ed.*

17. *History of Tinnevelly*, pp. 53-4.

18. *T.A.S.*, i, p. 60.

19. Bertrand, iii, p. 239.

20. *M.E.R.*, 1909, p. 86.

Travancore. There is ample, evidence to show that the Pāṇḍyas survived the establishment of the Nāyaks in Madura for nearly a century.

Mysore Aggression.—Mr. Rangachari is surprised that Barradas does not mention Rāja Uḍaiyār of Mysore in connection with the imperial war of succession. He argues, 'from the condition of the times', that he could not but have taken part in it in the cause of the empire. But his amplification of this statement only goes to prove that the Rāja of Mysore was a selfish and aggressive ruler.[21] There seems to be no evidence to charge Barradas with omission of facts in this instance. By regular conquest and annexations during his long reign, Rāja Uḍaiyār made his territories conterminous with the dominions of Madura. It appears probable that he took advantage of Muttu Vīrappa's engagement with Tanjore to send an army under one, called 'Mukiḷan' in the chronicles, to harry the Dindigul province.[22] It is said that the Polegars of Virūpākshi and Kaṇṇivāḍi vigorously repulsed the invaders and freed the country from danger. In return for this service, the chronicles say, the former was honoured with the title of '*Pāthai-Kāval*' (Defender of the Roads), and latter with that of 'Chinna-Mysūrān)' (Young Mysorean). Nelson[23] does not give any date for this invasion; Mr. Rangachri says that it was about 1620, in which year, according to him,[24] Rāja Uḍaiyār died.

21. *I.A.*, 1916, pp. 134-5.

22. Taylor, *O.H.MSS.*, ii, p. 169.

23. p. 119.

24. *I.A.*, 1916, p. 135.

About the year 1616, the date of the battle of Toppūr, the position of Rāja Uḍaiyār in Mysore could not have been such as to enable him to take any active part in the engagement. It has already been stated that he actually took possessin of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam in 1610. He had to wait and perhaps to adopt a policy of loyalty to the empire designedly to justify this aggressive act of his. He so far succeeded that he obtained a confirmatory charter from Venkaṭa in 1612. Even after the grant of this charter his position was insecure. There was the neighbouring viceroyatly of Channapaṭṭaṇa as an effective barrier between him and the other portions of the empire. This viceroyalty included in it the Salem Baramahals and was under the powerful family of Jagadēva Rāyal. The extent of territory occupied by him effectively almost at the end of his reign does not appear to have comprised more than the present-day district of Mysore with just the borderland beyond the hills in Coimbatore and Salem. It seems clear that, while his territory may have been conterminous with that of the Nāyaks of Madura, he was in no such condition of security in his possession of the newly-acquired viceroyalty, as to launch out into distant aggression against the territory of the powerful Nāyak of Madura. If he took any part in the battle of Toppūr, it must have been on the side of the emperor. But such action

Progress of Missonary Activities.—Encouraged by the first fruits of his labours, De Nobili built a new church in 1610, and secured some assistants, the chief of whom, Antonio Vico, reached Madura on the 15th of September. The latter's letter of 22nd November, 1610,[25] says that 'the court of the great Nāyak began to take part in persecution and menacing words came from the palace'. Laerzio's letter of 8th December, 1610, speaks of persecutions as rife in that year.[26] Another letter of 25th November, 1611, refers to a new persecution and the consequent diminution in the number of converts.[27] '*Hermècatti's*' (Erumaikaṭṭi) attitude towards Nobili changed a little, but soon became favourable. The chief obstacle to the further progress of Nobili's work came from the representations of Fernandez to the higher authorities, questioning its very foundamentals as cutting at the root of Christianity. The details of the charges made it appear that Nobili's religion was a 'monstrous' combination of Paganism and Christianity. It is not clear whether Fernandez was actuated in this step only by feelings of vengeance at the loss of his prestige and influence that followed Nobili's success. The Archbishop of Cranganore and the Provincial of Malabar, with whose consent Nobili had begun his work, consistently supported him against the vehemence of Fernandez. But when a new Provinicial succeeded Laerzio, Nobili's real difficulties commenced. Fernandez became active once more, and this time he was successful. De Nobili was summoned before a Synod, and he put up an able defence of his position. Since it came to no unanimous decision, the question was referred to the authorities in Europe. In 1613 Cardinal Bellarmine, his uncle, asked him to stop his work. From 1611 Nobili had been in suspense and could not properly attend to his duties; now he had to cease his activities altogether. For about ten years he fought incessantly to obtain a better hearing of his cause. Finally, on the 31st of January, 1623, the Papal Bull of Gregory XV exonerated him from almost all the charges, and approved of his methods. Thus, as Bertrand remarks,[28] 'the controversy about the rites, more fatal than

on his part would have been an invitation for the aggressions of the Nāyak of Madura, who was by far the most powerful of the Nāyaks, with the exception perhaps of Tanjore. This position of Rāja Uḍaiyār is confirmed by what we know of the operations that had to be actually undertaken against Śāmbaḷḷi and Bombaḷḷi in the reign of Kanṭhīrava Narasa. Unless the chronicles bring into the period a later effort by Mysore, it seems very unlikely that Rājā Uḍaiyār took any part in the battle of Toppūr. If Rāja Uḍaiyār had exhibited aggressiveness in this connection, the Nāyak of Madura would have thought twice before changing the capital to Trichinophly, *Ed.*

[25] Bertrand, ii, p. 92.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 108.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 197.

all the persecutions of Paganism, restrained the ardent zeal of De Nobili, suspended his conquests and endangered his work for more than ten years. At last, the intrepid missionary came out successful in this deplorable contest.'

So far as Mudura was concerned, this controversy resulted in an irreparable loss of prestige to De Nobili. From experience he realized that this ancient seat of Hinduism was not the best place for recruits to Christianity. Vico admits in his letter of 1624[29] that 'one will never encounter anywhere obstacles so great as in Madura'. Persecution was not the principal difficulty. Nobili's *via media* in religion could only end in displeasing both sides. There was much artificiality in his whole scheme, which could not escape careful observers. His experiment in Madura was a failure, and he turned his eyes thenceforward to the north.

Muttu Vīrappa's reign saw the beginnings of a new policy with regard to religion and imperial politics, and the premontions of the inevitable danger from Mysore. Till now the Nāyaks had not had to decide about their attitude with regard to an actively propagandist foreign religion; this question took definite shape only now. Muttu Vīrappa seems to have tolerated missionary activities only to a certain extent. He did not try the feelings of his subjects to the breaking-point, nor did he take up a policy of active persecution. The death of the Vijayanagar emperor, Venkaṭa I, and the period of confusion which followed it, gave Muttu Vīrappa an opportunity to discard the phantom of imperial sovereignty. It is not clear how far he succeeded in his attempt. Vico's letter of 30th August, 1611[30] speaks of irregular payment of tribute, even insolent refusal of it, and the emperor collecting it at the point of the sword, with the result that 'the people...pay for the fault of their princes' and that 'all the country is devastated and the people are plundered or massacred'. It is difficult to judge how far this estimate of Muttu Vīrappa's rule is the result of prejudice; in 1611 it was only about two years since he had ascended the throne. It is probable that he took more from his subjects than his predecessor had done, as he had his scheme of independence and the necessity to be prepared against aggression from Mysore. But the alleged tyrannical exercise of power by Muttu Vīrappa cannot be taken for a faithful picture of his rule, without adequate proof.

Death of Muttu Vīrappa.—This question will be considered in connection with the accession of Tirumala Nāyaka.

29 Bertrand, ii, p. 226.

30 *Ibid.*, p. 124. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 10.

CHAPTER VIII

TIRUMALA NĀYAKA

(*c.* 1623-1659)

Accession—Tirumala Nāyaka, the younger brother of Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka (not his son, as the Jesuit records say), succeeded him on the throne. With regard to the date of his accession, the chronicles are almost unanimous. The *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts*, the *Maduraittalavaralāṛu* and the *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle* put it on the 7th Māśi, Dundubhi (about the 19th of February, 1623); the *Supplementary Manuscript* gives the year as Dundubhi. Even the *History of the Carnataca Gover nors*, which never agrees in its chronology with the other chronicles, comes very near to them in this particular instance, and ascribes the accession of Tirumala to Durmati, the year previous to Dundubhi. This is a remarkable feature as far as the evidence of the chronicles goes.

But epigraphy does not lend support to this dating of the chronicles, viz. the 19th of February, 1623. There is an inscription of Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka, dated Ś. S. 1547, K. Ā. 798, Rudhirōdgāri, Vaikāśi 15.[1] In the *M E. R.*[2] L. the Śaka date is taken to be correct, and the other chronological details have been overlooked. The Kollam and cyclic years agree; K. Ā. 798 is from August, 1622 to August, 1623; the cyclic years Rudhirōdgāri runs from April, 1623, to April, 1624; Vaikāsi 15 would be about the 27th of May. Thus the correct date of this inscription, viz: 27th May, 1623, is in accord with both the Kollam and cyclic years, and conflicts only with the Śaka year. This is only one among numerous instances to show the inadvisability of pinning one's faith to a Śaka date by preference, even in the face of clear evidence of its inaccuracy. As was pointed out before, the cyclic date is likely to be more correct than the Śaka date, except in cases where the former has to be rejected on valid grounds. There is another inscription of Muttu Vīrappa,[3] dated

1 Appendix D, No. 125.
2 1917, pp. 131 and 134.
3 Appendix D, No. 123.

Ś.S. 1545, i.e. April, 1623, to April, 1624. A third inscription of his[4] is dated Ś.S. 1545, K.Ā. 799, Rudhirōdgāri, Kārtikai 16. The cyclic date is approximately the 30th of November ; the Śaka and Kollam years do not conflict with it. All these inscriptions go against the accession of Tirumala Nāyaka about the 19th of February, 1623. An inscription of Ś.S. 1545[5] speaks of Rāmaiya as the minister of Viśvanātha Nāyaka (Tirumala Nāyaka); this also puts the accession of Tirumala not earlier than April, 1623. But the cyclic year given in this record, viz. Śrīmukha, corresponds to 1633-4. Further, there are no inscriptions of Tirumala Nāyaka prior to 1633 ; even the inscription of 1630 refers only vaguely to a Periya Nāyakkaraiyan ;[6] the Taḍikkombu inscription of 1629 does not belong to him, as is alleged by Mr. Rangachari.[7] The Kūniyūr Plates of Venkaṭa II, dated 1634, seem to be the first definite epigraphical record of Tirumala Nāyaka. Thus inscriptional evidence does not go to confirm the pratically unanimous dating of the chronicles.

The Jesuit records give some indications of the date of Tirumala's accession. Vico's letter of 1626[8] speaks of Vīrappa Nāyaka as 'the powerful prince of this country'. Proenza's letter of 1559[9] says that Tirumala died in that year after a reign of thirty years ; this means that he ascended the throne about 1629. Muhammad Sharīff Hanafī notes in his *Majālisu-s-Salātīn* written in 1628,[10] that 'when on one occasion, he visited Madura, the ruler of that place died after a few days'. Sewell[11] thinks that the person referred to might be Muttu Krishṇappa, who died in 1609. If the Muhammadan writer were referring to such a distant event, he might have been more specific. It is likely that his sojourn in Madura was not long before the compilation of his work. If it were so, the death spoken of must have been that of Muttu Vīrappa, perhaps in 1627 or early in 1628.

These considerations show that the date of Tirumala Nayaka's accession is not established beyond doubt. It is not unlikely that Muttu Vīrappa died about 1627, even though Tirumala may have been the ruler of Madura from 1623 or 1624. This makes the position assumed in the Jesuit letters intelligible, viz. that they give a rough

4 *Ibid*, No. 124.
5 *Ibid.*, No. 121.
6 *Ibid*, No. 126.
7 Sewell, i, p. 289.
8 Bertrand, ii, p. 254.
9 *Ibid.*, iii, p. 50. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 1.
10 Sir H. Elliot, *History of India*, vii, d. 139.
11 ii. p. 201.

estimate of thirty years. The chronicles might have taken the *de facto* for the *de jure* king. Another consideration, is that even a modest estimate of the length of Muttu Vīrappa's reign, according to the chronicles, comes to twenty-one years, which may be from 1609 to 1629. Under these circumstances, it looks as though Tirumala Nāyaka ruled in the name of his predecessor from 1623-4, and that he became actual reler in his own right only in 1627-8. In any case, the date of Nelson (p. 121), viz. January, 1623, has to be changed to at least about the 19th of February of the same year. Though he quotes from the letter of Proenza of 1659, and records in French the particular statement that Tirumala Nāyaka died after a reign of thirty years,[12] he is disposed to accept more or less the date of the chronicles. He should have at least pointed out the discrepancy. Mr. Rangachari silently assumes 1623 as the correct date.

Change of Capital.—When Tirumala Nāyaka came to the throne, Trichinopoly was the capital. That he removed it to Madura is clear both from the chronicles and the Jesuit letters. The cause of this change is said by the former to be the cure of his disease of catarrh, which the gods of Madura alone were able to effect. The story is given in full by Nelson and Mr. Rangachari. They agree with the chronicles, and think that the transfer of capital was 'purely the result of accident'. Both of them speak of the superior claims of Trichinopoly, as the capital or the Nāyak dominions, on the grounds of defence, climate, etc. But they discount the influence of historical associations[13] in the choice of a capital, and are too much obsessed by the latter-day conditions of the two places. They do not try to explain why Madura survived in the struggle till the second half of the seventeenth century. Though Trichinopoly was easier to defend, it was too near the zone of war. It was not sufficiently central to control the whole kingdom. To capture Madura would have meant the reduction of Trichinopoly and other forts, like Dindigul, in the interior. The experience of the last Nāyak rulers proved the folly of removing the capital to Trichinopoly. The Vijayanagar empire's loss of power and prestige, after the battle of Talikota. was to some extent due to the capture and sack of the capital, which was on the northern borders of the empire. The removal of the French capital from Paris during the recent European War indicates the danger of

[12] p. 142.

[13] These considerations are acutely analyzed, with reference to Rome, by viscount Bryce (*Holy Roman Empire*, 7th ed., p. 311). He refers to the 'enthusiasm for a famous name' as a powerful factor in politics, and remarks that Italy's passion for Rome as a capital is the result of the firm conviction that 'national life can never thrill with a strong and steady pulsation till the ancient capital has become the nation's heart'.

capital on the confines of a country. Madura was the centre of civilization and the heart of the kingdom in every respect : it represented the best in Hindu life and thought of those times. The disadvantages spoken of by Nelson would not have been insuperable, as the recent progress of Madura, which makes it the second city in the Presidency, testifies.

It is difflult to believe that Tirumala, a monarch of great ability, acted capriciously in such an important matter as the location of the capital of his kingdom. Probably, he was only deliberately following a wise precedent, hallowed by the experience of ages. His own views in regard to the imperial connection may have led him to remove his headquarters to a place safer than Tirchinopoly, because more in the interior. Since he wished to rule in reality, he may have realized the need for a more central place to make his influence felt all round. This must have been an important consideration in those times when difficulties of travel were admittedly great. It is also likely that his religious fervour directed his affections to this ancient seat of (God) Sundaresvara and the Pandyas. Tirumala's passion for religious architecture may have given room for cynical-minded people to attribute motives and invent stories, To accept such fabrications is to stifle the spirit of historical enquiry. It is less dangerous to err on the side of scepticism than on that of credulity.

With regard to the date of tranfer of capital, the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts*[14] ascribe it to the month Chittirai of the year Akshaya (April-May, 1626). Mr. Rangachari, perhaps following Taylor's translation of the same, puts in the 1623.[15] Nelson[16] says, that 'before he (Tirumala) came to Madura to be crowned, the Court had been held at Trichinopoly for some ten or twelve years', i.e., Madura became the capital about 1635. Neither of them states his authority. A Jesuit letter of 1624[17] speaks of Trichinopoly as the usual residence of the Nāyak; another letter of 1640[18] says that the Nāyak resided at Trichinopoly; in a third letter of 1644,[19] the Nāyak's residence is said to be in Madura. From these references it appears that the change of capital must have taken place between 1640 and 1644. The inscriptions of Tirumala Nāyak from 1634 to 1644 are found at Kūniyūr, Āḷaḍiyūr

14 Taylor, O.*H. MSS.*, ii, p. 148
15 *I.A.*, 1915, p. 71 ; 1916. p. 149.
16 p. 122.
17 Bertrand, ii, p. 226.
18 *Ibid.*, p. 309
19 *Ibid.*, p. 346.

Kapilamalai, Mēlāmbūr, Vēmbangudi, Tiruppalātturai, Tirumuruganpūndi and Pudūr ; and therefore many of them in the Madura, Ramnad, and Tinnevelly districts, If, from this, the inference is permissible that the capital may have been changed about 1634, Nelson's opinion would have epigraphical support.

Early Years.—The first act of Tirmala Nāyaka after his accession was according to Nelson, a careful organization of the defences of the kingdom with a view to independence. Evidently Nelson accepts the following observations of Bertrand, the editor of the Jesuit letters: [20] 'The great Nāyak died, and was succeeded by his son (brother) Tirumala Nāyaka, the most illustrious of the kings of Madura. The latter, in pursuance of the project of his father (brother), which was to overthrow the domination of Bisnagar, wished to put himself in a condition to resist the armies of this monarch. With this object he constructed two fortresses on the frontier of his dominions, raised an army of 30,000 men ..These preparations excited much movement and disquiet in the whole country.' Therefore, Nelson is not quite correct in saying that this information is contained in the Jesuit letters. Further, he remarks that 'it was Tirumala who for the first time shook off the Vijayanagar yoke'.[21] The meaning intended is not quiet clear. If Nelson means that, of the Madura Nāyak, Tirumala was first to make himself actually independent, his view may be accepted as correct, though the attempt made by Muthu Vīrappa Nāyaka in this direction cannot be forgotten. But Mr. Rangachari goes further, and says that no provincial chief had so far dared to turn his province into a kingdom'.[22] This view is contradicted by himself in the following remarks: 'By the year 1610 he (Rāja Uḍaiyār of Mysore) succeeded in capturing Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam itself and thus putting an end to the imperial viceroyalty.[23] Even before the accession of Tirumala, Mr. Rangachari speaks of the 'aggressive and ambitious monarch' of Mysore. Thus he himself makes it clear that Tirumala Nāyaka had been anticipated in his move by the Mysore rulers. Moreover, the Jesuit evidence goes to prove that Mysore became independent of Vijayanagar long before Madura. The letter of Proenza, dated 1659,[24] says that 'Mysore...had long ago withdrawn herself from subordination to the same monarch' (the emperor of Vijayanagar) and that the latter was driven to the necessity of begging help from

20 *Ibid.* ii, p. 198

21 p. 124.

22 *I.A.*, 1916, p. 166.

23 *Ibid.*, pp. 134-5.

24 Bertrand, iii, p. 42. *Vide.* Appendix A, Letter No. 1.

'the king of Mysore, once the vassal of his crown'.[25] It is explicitly stated that Mysore achieved independence before Tirumala's attempt at it, which is said to have been only in continuation of the policy of Muttu Vīrappa probably in imitation of that of Mysore.

There seems to be no evidence to show that Tirumala Nāyaka prepared for a war against the Vijayanagar emperor at the very beginning of his reign. He was careful to make himself strong in defence: even later on he was not disposed to be aggressive. Mr. Rangachari puts the league of Tirumala with Tanjore and Gingi at the commencement of his reign; this seems to be the result of his not being able to use the Jesuit letters in the original. Proenza's letter specifically says that the league was formed when the 'new king' (Śrīranga III, who came to the throne in 1642 after the death

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

Tirumala Nāyaka's effort at independence can be regarded as neither new nor unprecedented. The first feudatory to make himself independent in all but name was undoubtedly Rāja Uḍaiyār of Mysore. That he should have undertaken a war againist Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam, his direct superior in the empire, was an aggressive act, which, while it may have received the countenance of the empire in its peculiar circumstances of difficulty, must have been regarded with suspicion even by the very emperor who confirmed him in possession of the territory of the viceroyalty, perhaps as an act of policy. Rāja Uḍaiyār conducted himself to all appearance as a loyal feudatory of the empire while Venkaṭapati was alive. In the revolutions that followed his death he was too much occupied nearer home in securing his position to make any decisive intervention. When his grandson, Chāmarāja Uḍaiyār, succeeded him, his Daḷavāys took advantage of the confusion in the empire to aggrandize the rising new state by annexing as much of the Channapaṭṭaṇa viceroyalty to its territories as they possibly could. This must have been regarded both by Mysoreans and by the imperialists as an act of pure aggression. During this period Mysore had to pay attention to a new danger in the aggressive activity of the Sultans of Bijapur, and Bijapur invasions seem to have become a normal item calling for the attention of the foreign department of Mysore. Though most, if not all, of Chāmarāja's inscriptions preserve the form of allegiance to the empire, the acts of Chāmarāja throughout his reign show a disregard for the empire that would warrant the assumption that the allegiance indicated was only nominal. We have not come upon any record of Mysore's having paid tribute to the empire: the aggressions of Bijapur would be a justification for not paying it, if justification were required. Chāmarāja's successor, Kanṭhīrava Narasa, openly threw off the mask at a time he could do so without being called traitor to the empire, but that was only a formal act. The Nāyaks of Madura, the predecessors of Tirumala, were in no better case. The disloyalty of Madura can be said to have begun almost with the accession of Venkaṭapati to the throne, and it is this disloyalty that infected the viceroy nephew of Venkaṭapati himself who played an equally treacherous part against his uncle and retired to his own viceroyalty of Srīrangapaṭṭaṇam. It is thus clear that the very last years of the emperor Śrīranga and the early years of Venkaṭapati were the years when Madura projected a movement towards independence, and the almost regular hostility to Tanjore may be a direct results of this. It will thus be clear that it was the province of Madura that set the example in regard to this disloyal movement, the viceroy of Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam only following the bad example. Rāja Uḍaiyār's effort of course comes later. This position of Madura is intelligible. It

of Venkaṭa II) declared war, soon after his accession, against Tirumala.[26] No definite motive can be ascribed to Tirumala in organizing the defences of the kingdom at the very outset of his reign. He may have expected aggression from Mysore or strong measures from the Vijayanagar emperor. In his time, a state of preparedness for war was essential even without any clear objective. The features of the policy of Tirumala Nāyaka towards the Vijayanagar emperor developed only later on under the pressure of circumstances.[27] His original idea was probably to humour the emperor with occasional presents, without paying regular tribute. But he was not allowed to continue this ambiguous relationship for long.

was in several respects the premier viceroyalty and carrled with it the responsibility of keeping the coast clear of foreign enterprise of a disintegrating character ; it had also to keep Travancore under its thumb. It had facilities for coming into communication with the Portuguese who grew in the early years of the seventeenth century hostile both to Tanjore and Ceylon, and got dislodged from the coast of the former. These circumstances would place Madura in a position to acquire power among the Nāyaks easily. This pre-eminent position of Madura was the result of Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala's operations in the south and the maintenance of the high position by the Nāyaks following. Vīrappa I cherished this ambition of independence as against the empire, which was growing weaker as Madura was growing stronger.—*Ed.*

26 Bertrand, iii, pp. 42-3. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 1.

27 Tirumala's attitude towards the emperor depended upon the conditions of the empire for the time being. The aggressions of Bijapur and Golkonda, which had lasted a little more than the half century since the battle of Talikota, had been drawing to a close, after a period of very considerable activity, in the last years of the reign of Venkaṭa II. It was about that time that the Moghuls appeared in the Dakhan and adopted a vigorous policy of subjugating the Dakhan kingdoms. It was no doubt true that in the first years the kingdom of Ahmadnagar had to bear the brunt of it, but the two southern Sultans could not be altogether indifferent or inactive. If they did not go forward actively to help their neighbour and form a combination against the common enemy (and this would have been their clearest line of action in their own interest), their attention must certainly have been diverted in the direction of the north. That period synchronises with the active movement of Tirumala towards independence in the south. Soon after the battle of Talikota the northern of the Bhamani kingdoms had to turn north against the first movements of the Moghuls towards the Dakhan under Akbar ; the two southern kindgdoms were left to manage between them the empire of Vijayanagar badly crippled by the battle. They had come to an understanding in regard to the division of the territories of this Hindu empire. Bijapur was to pursue her aggressions in the territory above the Ghats and Golkonda was allowed for her share the country below the Ghats. The first efforts of the emperors and their loyal feudatories in the north as well as of the new-born state of Mysore were in this direction, to meet the Muhammadan invasions whenever they should come as they did come very often. The emperor at Penukoṇḍa and the new ruler of Mysore being thus occupied, the southern viceroys had a free hand to manage their own affairs. It was open to them to have realized the danger which certainly was imminent and urgent for the northern parts, but was also a real danger, even in regard to the southern viceroyalties, though comparatively remote. Sound and far-seeing policy

War with Mysore.—In the early years of Tirumala's reign, an invasion of Madura by Mysore and acounter-invasion of Mysore by Madura are recorded in a *Mackenzie Manuscript.*[28] These events are said to have happened before Tirumala's war with the Sētupati. Nelson[29] does not give any date; Mr. Rangachari makes a guess, viz 1625.[30] The cause of the Mysore aggression is not stated. Perhaps the ambitious Chāmarāja Uḍaiyār did not require even a pretext; or, as Nelson thinks, he probably wanted to make amends for the failure of his predecessor's invasion of Madura in the region of Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka. The Mysore general, 'Harasura (Karachūri ?) Nandi Rāja,' marched as far as Dindigul, but

required that these viceroys should hold 'together and give their support without stint, as their duty and loyalty alike demanded, to the empire in this position of jeodardy. Madura generally, since the commencement of the new century at any rate, cannot be regarded as having taken into calculation the actual political condition of the times. The empire was struggling for existence during the first forty years of the century and had barely succeeded in maintaining its existence by being driven successively out from one capital on to another. Penukoṇḍa had to be vacated because of the constant harrying of the Muhammadan invasions, Chandragiri had similarly to be abandoned, and, early in the reign of Śriranga III, Vellore was being laid siege to. These changes did not happen in a short campaign or two, but by persistent effort of no less than three decades. The absorption of the Channapaṭṭaṇa viceroyalty by Mysore enabled her to make a stand against the aggressions of Bijapur which were now under the guidance of a man of genius, Shahji the Mahratta. The whole brunt of the efforts of Golkonda had to be borne by the empire practically single-handed. If Tirumala had only realized the situation and had the foresight to see the political consequences of the disintegrating movement of which he had made himself the sponsor, if not the author, he would certainly have adopted a policy of co-operation with the empire. The question of Tirumala's loyalty or disloyalty therefore depends upon the question whether, in the political conditions of his time, he could have foreseen the direct results of his action. The action of his predecessors and their attitude towards the empire must necessarily have made it impossible for him to take an impartial view of the situation at the time. The interests of Mysore and the empire ran together a great way. It was the governments behind these two that were for the time saved from the attacks of the Muhammadans. It cannot but have been clear to these, chief among them Tirumala, that what befell the empire would befall them soon after. If Mysore saved herself by sustained effort, the joint efforts of the emperor and his greater feudatories should have been equally successful. That Tirumala and his friends did not adopt this course of action argues either disloyalty or want of political foresight, either of the alternatives not redounding to the credit of the great Nāyak of Madura. Śrīranga's abortive effort exhibits a political prevision and a partriotism under trying circumstances, which shines in lurid contrast with the selfishness of the greater viceroys who had everything to gain by a united effort, and who had, without fully realizing the consequences, thrown away the glorious chance in their selfish shortsightedness—*Ed.*

[28] Taylor, *O H. MSS.*, ii, pp. 169-75.

[29] pp. 125-6.

[30] *I.A.*, 1916, p. 166.

was beaten back by the Madura Daḷavāy, Rāmappaiya, and Raṅgaṇṇa Nāyaka, the Polegar of Kaṇṇivāḍi. The latter are said to have pushed their success further and besieged the capital of Mysore. Nelson and Mr. Rangachari narrate the account of the chronicle in detail, and speak of the renall of Rāmappaiya and his disobedience, which, after all, did not go against him in the end. The Daḷavāy returned completely victorious and was greatly honoured by Tirumala Nāyaka. Perhaps the inscription of Śrīmukha (1633), which records his gift of land at Kīḷakkuḷattūr to the local temple, and which speaks of him as the minister of Viśvanātha Nāyaka (Tirumala Nāyaka), was issued after this successful operation against Mysore.[31]

The Invasion of Travancore.—Ever since Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala's campaign against the Tiruvaḍi and the latter's, reduction to the position of a feudatory of Vijayanagar, reflected in the Suchīndram inscription of 1547,[32] Travancore appears to have given up her aggressive attitude and remained loyally subordinate to the Nāyaks of Madura. Under Tirumala Nāyaka this amicable relātionship seems to have been disturbed. The chronicles have nothing to say about this affair. An edict of the king of Travancore Uṇṇi Kēraḷa Varma), dated 22nd Kumbham (Māśi), K.Ā. 810 (the begining of March, 1635), records the remission of some taxes on land consequent on the invasion of Tirumala Nāyaka.[33] The former came to the throne in 1631,[34] and he seems to have refused payment of the customary tribute. The actual cause of this invasion, and how it was conducted are not recorded. The above-mentioned epigraphical record runs as follows:—'Whereas it has been represented to us at our residence at Kalkuḷam by the nāṭṭārs (ryots) between Mangalam and Maṇakuḍi...that the country is smitten by calamities, having had no cultivation of the *Kār* (Kanni) crop of 810 and that as *Piśāṇam* (Kumbham) cultivation was not begun owing to the advent of Tirumal Nāyakkar's forces and as the crops raised... suffered by blight, the ryots have not the wherewithal to begin fresh cultivation, we are pleased to command on this the 22nd day of the month of Māśi in 810 that the levying of...(toxes) be given up and that this fact...be duly notified to the ryots of the said places in the southern portion of Nāñjināḍ North.' It is clear, therefore, that

[31] Appendix D, No 121.

[32] *Ibid.*, No. 26.

[33] V. Nagam Aiya, *The Travancore State Manual*, i, pp. 302-3. Appendix D, 129.

[34] V. Nagam Aiya, *The Travancore State Manual*, i, p. 275.

Tirumala Nāyakā's invasion must have taken place after Kanni and before Kumbham, K.Ā. 810 (between October, 1634 and March, 1635). This is confirmed by the fact that it was undertaken in the name of the Vijayanagar emperor after the issue of the Kūniyūr Plates of Venkaṭa II (May-June, 1634).[35]

Tirumala Nāyaka's invasion of Travancore seems to have been successful, and his gift of land to the Āḷaḍryur Śiva temple,[36] dated K.Ā. 811 (1635), may have been in commemoration of it. If it is a fact that the king of Nānjināḍ took part in the war against the Sētupati (which came later), as the *Rāmappaiyan Ammānai* says, it confirms Tirumala's success in the Travancore campaign. There is also a reference in this poem to the conquest of the Malayāḷam country by Madura. The effect of this invasion seems to have lasted for a long time. John Nieuhoff[37] remarks in 1664 that the king of Travancore 'constantly keeps a garrison of ten thousand Negros (Nāyars) here to secure it (the capital) against the Nayk of Madure whosep ower is much dreaded here'.

Relations with the Sētupati.—Kūttan Sētupati became the chief of Ramnad about 1623. He seems to have ruled till 1635, and was succeeded by his son, Śaḍaika Tēva II (Daḷavāy Sētupati). After a peaceful rule of about two years, the latter was threatened by the machinations of his illegitimate brother, called the 'Tambi' (younger brother), who was able to convince the authorities at Madura of the legitimacy of his claims to be the Sētupati. But the Daḷavāy was prepared to fight out his case, and he had a large measure of popular support. The situation thus created necessitated a war against him, since Tirumala supported his opponent's candidature. Some chronicles state that the insubordination of the Daḷavāy and his withdrawal of tribute were the causes of the war. The issues connected with this question are not clear. Only the main events of Tirumala's campaign emerge definitely from the mists of romance. Mr. Ranagachari gives a very detailed abstract of the *Rāmappaiyan Ammānai*, which he calls 'one of the most valuable historical documents of the period'.[38] He is not disposed to remove the chaff, but revels in romantic imagery. The chronicles are on a better footing when compared with this ballad, though the latter contains more information. It is not known on what authority Nelson[39] bases his account.

[35] *Archoeological Survey of India, Report*, 1911-2, p. 195.

[36] Appendix D, No. 130.

[37] p. 265. *Vide* Appendix C.

[38] *I.A.*, 1916, pp. 170-1; 178-84.

[39] pp. 128-30.

Rāmappaiya was entrusted with the conduct of this war, with Raṅgaṇṇa Nāyaka as second-in-command. After some reverses, he managed to subdue the country as far as Ramnad, when the Sētupati took refuge in the island of Rāmēśvaram. A bridge was constructed over the Pāmban to facilitate the movement of the army into the island, with the result that the Sētupati was captured and taken prisoner to the capital. The importance of the campaign is sufficiently clear from the part taken in it by the Portuguese and the Dutch. Tirumala Nāyaka enlisted the support of the former, probably when when the latter, who were on the aggressive then, joined the Sētupati. The reference to sea-fights in the *Rāmappaiyan Ammānai* is indirectly confirmed by Portuguese records and the Jesuit letters. An inlluminating extract from F.C. Danvers[40] is worth quoting: 'The Naique of Madura sent his ambassador, Ramapa, to the Viceroy, on the 13th August, 1639, to give an assurance on his account to the King of Portugal that, in consideration of the assistance sent him when he wished to take Marava, he undertook to give the King of Portugal a fortress in Pampa, called Uthear, 'or wherever he might desire one, with a Portuguese captain, 50 Portuguese soldiers, 100 lascars, and 3,000 pardaos, for the maintenance of the same; also to build at his own expense a church at Ramanacor, and seven churches between Bambam (Pāmban) and Tomddy (Toṇḍi). The Naique also gave permission to all those who might desire it to become Christians and promised to furnish gratuitously to the King of Portugal all the assistance he might require for Ceylon, both in men and supplies. He further undertook not to be friendly to the Dutch, nor to permit them in his territories, whilst his vessels would also not be permitted to visit Dutch ports.[41] Mr. A. Rea[42] makes a reference to the Dutch help which the Sētupati procured.[43] The letter of Proenza, dated

[40] *Report*, pp. 43-4.

[41] See also F.C. Danvers, *The Portuguese in India*, ii, p. 268.

[42] *Monumental Remains of the Dutch East India Company*, p.8.

[43] The position of the Portuguese had in it elements that contributed to the disintegration of the Hindu states in the peninsula. This did not become so clear until through the effort of Francis Xavier on the Parava coast, a large number of these fisherfolk had been converted to Christianity. These conversions were held to imply *ipso facto* a change of political loyalty from the Indian ruler to the king of Portugal, and called for drastic intervention on the part of the empire of Vijayanagar. Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala, with his brother Timma, was deputed on this important mission, and after that the Portuguese had to face the hostility of the empire of Vijayanagar more or less; but the empire was not alone in its opposition to this particular aspect of missionary effort. Later on, as the sixteenth century was drawing to a close, the activities of the Portnguese grew greater and contributed very largely to the fall of native rulers in India as well as in Ceylon. This aggressive effort made them so obnoxious that the

1659,[44] speaks of the Maravas as a warlike people who had fought creditably against Europeans.

Nelson speaks of the death of Rāmappaiya before the conclusion of the Marava campaign. The *History of the Carnataca Covernors, a Mackenzie Manuscript*[45] and the *Rāmappaiyan Ammānai*, none of these gives the slightest ground for such a supposition. There is an inscrition of 1638 (about the 27th of May) which refers to him along with Tirumala Nāyaka.[46] The extract from Danvers quoted above mentions him as the ambassador sent to Goa on the 13th of August, 1639, and makes it clear that he could have died only a few years after the successful termination of the campaign against the Sētupati. The precise date of his death is uncertain; an inscription of 1648[47] refers to a particular arrangement 'in the time of Rāmappaiyan', and so he must have died some years before that date.

The successful conclusion of this war did not settle the Marava question. The people would not acquiesce in the rule of the 'Tambi'. The latter met with strong opposition from Raghunātha Tēva and Nārāyaṇa Tēva, nephews of the Daḷavāy Sētupati. The country reverted to confusion and disorder. His inability to stem this tide of disaffection and restore order stood revealed ; and he approached Tirumala Nāyaka for help. Though the latter may have first acted without considering the real state of affairs in Ramnad country, he

orthodox Tanjore Nāyak, Achyuta, had to turn them out of Negapatam by main force, as he is made to declare that even by their summary dislodgment from Negapatam they had not learnt wisdom. They tranferred their political activity thereafter on the Tanjore coast to Dēvikoṭṭa at the mouth of the Coleroon, and were declared by Gōvinda Dikshita, the minister, to be the power behind the chieftain who harried the country round and assumed an attitude of defiance against his liege lord, the Nāyak of Tanjore. When Raghunātha Nāyaka succeeded to the throne, he had to dislodge the Portuguese from Dēvikoṭṭa and restore the Rāja of Jaffna who had been dispossessed by them; and he had to fight the battle of Toppūr with a considerable Portuguese contingent in the Pāṇḍyan army. We find the Portnguese again in alliance with the Nāyak of Madura in his campaign against his feudatory of the Marava country. In this position of affairs the Indian powers hostile to the Portuguese, finding themselves probably unequal to them on the sea, had recourse necessarily to the other European power, the Dutcb. Thus we see the Madura Nāyak actively in alliance with the Portguese, and Tanjore and even Ramnad in alliance with the Dutch. The treaty referred to by Danvers is in keeping with this condition of political division in the country.—*Ed.*

[44] Bertrand, iii, p. 48. *Vide* Appendix A. Letter No. 1.

[45] Taylor; *O.H. MSS.*, ii, p. 175.

[46] Appendix D, No. 132.

[47] *Ibid.*, No. 140.

was now in no mood to countenance the schemes of the 'Tambi'. Realizing that only the Daḷavāy Sētupati could properly rule over a turbulent people, he set him free and recognized him as the Sētupati. In a short time the country returned to peaceful ways, as is indicated by an inscription at Vēmbanguḍi of 1641 for the merit of Thirumala Nāyaka.[48] The Sētupati ruled firmly and wisely for a few years, but was murdered by the 'Tambi' about 1645. Thereupon Tirumala Nāyaka divided the whole Marava country into three parts with the idea of satisfying all the claimants, viz., Raghunatha Tēva, his brother Tanakka Teva and the 'Tambi'. When the second died, this solution of the question was threatened. Fortunately for the peace of the country, the 'Tambi' also soon died, and Raghunātha Tēva became ruler of the whole Ramanad country. Gradually the wounds of the recent troubles were healed, and the blessings of a strong and beneficent rule restored. Raghunātha Sētupati became a loyal and staunch supporter of Tirumala Nāyaka, to whom he rendered signal service on many occasions. Nelson[49] says that he repulsed a Muhammadan raid and crushed the rebellion of a few Polegars headed by the chief of Eṭṭiyapuram in Tinnevelly. For this latter service, he was given some land near Mannārkōvil and some share in the revenue from the pearl-fishery; for the former, he was honoured with the title of the 'Defender of the Kingdom' and allowed to celebrate the 'Navarātri' festival in his own capital on the same scale as at Madura—a unique distinction. His improvements in Rāmēśvaram made him the 'Master of Rāmēśvara'. Thus his wisdom and loyalty increased his power and prestige, and redounded to his honour; they also secursed the safty of the whole kingdom of Madura.

War with the Emperor.—Tirumala Nāyaka seems to have accepted the overlordship of the Vijayanagar emperor for a long time after his accession, till at least 1634, the date of the Kūniyūr Plates of Venkaṭa II. This subordinatian could have only been nominal. From the Jesuit evidence it is clear that he aimed at practical independence including non-payment of tribute. This view seems to have been the direct result of the prevailing political condition of the times. In the early days of the Nāyakship, the empire was to Madura a safeguard against foreign aggression, and provided security for her against troubles from its other parts. When the emperor could not control the ambitions of Mysore and was powerless to provide the advantages due from a suzerain power, the tribute demanded from Madura would naturally have been felt vexatious. Tirumala had to fall back on his resources alone to defend his kingdom. Though

48 Appendix D, No. 133.

49 p. 138.

unwilling to pay tribute, he was inclined to respect the sovereign and accept his superior position. His seems to have had no objection to the subordination that this formal relationship involved, as is attested by his Kaṇṇadiputtūr inscription of 1655[50].

The Kūniyūr Plates of Venkaṭa II refer to Tirumala Nāyaka in very respectful terms, but Mr. Rangachari says that they were issued at his 'humble and loyal request'.[51] The expression used (Śrīmat-Tirumalēndrasya Vigñaptimanupālayan) really means, 'in accordance with the wishes of the prosperous and eminent ruler Tirumala'. Venkaṭa II seems to have been very wise in reading aright, and yielding to, the tendency of the times. His death in 1642 and the policy of his successor, Śrīranga III, put an end to this delicate and ambiguous relationship, and forced a war on Tirumala. The new emperor insisted on his technical rights, and precipitated a crisis by marching to the south at the head of a large army. Tirumala formed an alliance with the Nāyaks of Tanjore and Gingi to oppose the onward march of Śrīranga. When the Tanjore Nāyak revealed the schemes of the confederates to the latter and betrayed his allies, Tirumala had seriously to think about new measures to save himself. In this predicament it was open to Tirumala to throw himself upon the mercy of the emperor and give up ideas of independence; or, in the alternative, to secure his independence by all means in his power. To understand Tirumala's policy aright, it is necessary to have a grasp of the trend of South Indian politics in those times.[52] Self-

[50] Appendix D, No. 147,

[51] *I.A.*, 1916, p. 185.

[52] About the middle of Tirumala's reign when Śrīranga, the last emperor of Vijayanagar, made an active effort to bring the empire together for a common effort against the Muhammadans, the political condition of South India was somewhat as follows — Shah Jahan's efforts in the Dakhan were becoming more and more successful, and began to occupy, in a rising degree, the attention of Bijapur. and even, to a certain degree, of Golkonda. So the attention of the Muhammadan powers was being seriously diverted at the beginning of the struggle, which ultimately cost them their existence. The emperor, who had recently succeeded to the throne, apparently found this a suitable opportunity to make one serious effort to bring the empire together again and organize the imperial resources for a final stand along what had been the third line of defence of the great empire of Vijayanagar in the centuries preceding. The Nāyak of Ikkēri was so hemmed in by Bijapur on the one side and Mysore on the other that he found it safe to throw in his lot with the empire. Chāmarāja Uḍaiyār of Mysore had just managed to absorb into his territory the disintegrating viceroyalty of Channapaṭṭaṇa and thus prevented a greater part of it with the Baramahals from falling into the hands of Bijapur. The emperor was in Vellore with the central salient definitely loyal. Southward of these lay the viceroyalties of Gingi, of Tanjore, and of Madura, occupying the block of territory south of the Pālār.

interest had become the governing motive in political transactions. Even religion hardly entered into the calculation; so far as South India was concerned, there was no close wall of separation between the Hindus and the Muhammadans. Many a time the Muhammadan states of the Dakhan did not act conjointly in their struggle with Vijayanagar. Some of them called in the help of the latter against their own co-religionists. The great Vijayanagar minister, Rāmarāja, helped the Muhammadans in their internal-struggles. According to the conceptions of the day, it did not offend against political morals for the Muhmmadans to seek Hindu help and *vice-versa.*

Failing in this first move of a combination of the Nāyaks against the emperor, Tirumala induced the Sultan of Golkonda to attack the kingdom of Vellore and arrest the progress of the emperor. His diplomacy was successful, and the latter had to retrace his steps to defend his own territory. At first the emperor defeated his enemy; but soon after he was overpowered. He realized that success was possible only if the Nāyaks of Gingi, Tanjore, and Madura willingly co-operated with him, and consequently hastened to the south to organize opposition against Golkonda with their help. But this attempt at *rapprochement* did not make much progress, and he despaired of success in his imperial efforts. He therefore fled to the forests lying to the north of Tanjore and, after a few months of despondency, found asylum in Mysore. The following remarks of Thevenot elucidate the position further, though he gives a different account[58]: 'The want of assistance (when attacked by Aurangzib) on that King's (the emperor of Vijayanagar's) part so exasperated the King of Bijapur that he no sooner made peace with the Moghul in 1650, but he made a league with the King of Golconda against the King of Bisnagar and entered into a war with him; they handled him so very roughly that, at length, they stripped him of his

Of these, Tanjore remained traditionally loyal. It was Gingi and Madura that were the cause of trouble. In the early years of Śrīranga's reign a siege of Vellore, where Śrīranga was besieged by the Golkonda forces, was raised by the efforts of Śivappa Nāyaka of Ikkēri and the chieftains of second rank in the middle districts. It would not have appeared unlikely to Śrīranga that, if the southern viceroyalties could be brought to their allegiance and if the resources of all these could be put together, an effective stand against the Muhammadans was possible, and with the Moghul diversion in the north it must have seemed to him that the chances therefore could not in the circumstances of the time be regarded as foolish. The responsibility for not co-operating in this effort must rest with the southern viceroys, chiefly the Nāyak of Madura, and there was nothing in the situation except perhaps selfishness to justify his attitude, not merely of aloofness, but even of active hostility.—*Ed.*

[58] *Travels,* Part iii, p. 91.

dominions...so that...(he) was left without a kingdom and constrained to fly into the mountains, where he still lives.'

After completing the conquest of the kingdom of Vellore, Golkonda seems to have aimed at subduing the territories farther south, and laid siege to Gingi. The Nāyak of Tanjore became panic-stricken, and completely surrendered to the enemy. But Tirumala Nāyaka did not lose courage; he concluded an alliance with Bijapur, and was helped with some 17, 000 cavalry. With these and his 30,000 infantry, he marched to the relief of Gingi. This effective help, combined with the strength of the fortifications of Gingi, rendered a protracted siege possible. But Golkonda came to an agreement with the Bijapur army, and, entrusting it with the siege of Gingi, withdrew to the north to consolidate her recent conquests. This *volte face* on the part of Bijapur, and quarrels among the heterogeneous army of the besieged, upset all calculations, and the Muhammadans took possession of Gingi.

After the capture of Gingi the Muhammadans entered according to the Jesuit account, the dominions of the Nāyaks of Tanjore and Madura, and wrought incalculable havoc. Consequently they were able to dictate their own terms to them. But a chronicle, highly praised by Taylor for its 'good sense' and for its being 'in conformity, to a prevailing degree, with European notions of History', after speaking of Vijayarāghava 'purchasing peace', says: 'Tirumala Nāyakar, by the assistance of the Collaries (*Kaḷḷans*), routed and repelled the Muhammadans, who returned discomfited to Gingi.'[54] From other evidence also—to be referred to later on—it is clear that Tirumala was not the craven that he is taken to be by the Jesuit writers.

Soon after the return of the Muhammadans, Śrīranga III tried to regain his kindom with the help of Mysore. Following perhaps a hint thrown out by the Jesuit authorities as to what Tirumala Nāyaka's right policy ought to have been under the circumstances, Nelson remarks that he should have befriended the king of Mysore, and formed a league with him to support Śrīranga in the re-establishment of the kingdom of Vellore. But this was a policy which Tirumala could not be expected to adopt, as Madura had suffered from the repeated aggressions of Mysore.[55]

[54] C. R., iii, p. 40.

[55] About the time when Śrīranga made this effort, the aggressions of Mysore on the Madura country could not have been so real as to make an alliance between Madura and Mysore impossible if a common loyalty to the empire still

By reading between the lines of the Jesuit account, it is plain that Madura was threatened by the new understanding between the emperor and the king of Mysore, who did not come to the help of Śrīranga in the beginning of his contest with the Muhammadans. Tirumala sought the help of Bijapur again. There is a serious contradiction in the Jesuit evidence, and also in Nelson's account. If Tirumala's dominions were overrun by the armies of Bijapur before, and he had been treated very insultingly and treacherously by them, it is very strange that he, a staunch Hindu, still clung to the idea of the Muhnmmadan alliance in preference to a Hindu league. The subsidy he would have had to pay for the Muhammadan help is what is probably represented as blackmail. It is likely that the Nāyak of Tanjore was not spared by the Muhammadans on account of his weak and vacillating attitude. The Bijapur general, 'Canacan' (Khan-i-Khanan), frustrated the ambitions of Śrīranga and humbled the pride of Mysore with the help of Madura. Thus Tirumala Nāyaka succeeded in his policy of safeguarding his interests, though at much cost to his kingdom and those of his neighbours. The policy, however, may be regarded as having been forced on him by the hasty and incautious action of Śrīranga.[56]

operated. The aggressions of Mysore against Madura were yet to begin. While it is barely possible that in the reign of Chāmarāja an aggression or two of a very temporary character may have taken place on the northern borders of the Madura viceroyalty, the Mysore ruler was fully engaged in keeping Bijapur out and in occupying the territory of the Channapaṭṭaṇa viceroyalty above the Ghats and moving forward to take possession of such of Jagadēvarāya's territories as were below the Ghats. This last stage of operations could be carried to completion only in the reign of Kanṭhīrava Narasa. So far, then, the operations of Mysore could have been only to extend their frontiers to the foothills that separated the Mysore plateau from the plain country below. This probably had the countenance even of the emperor Venkaṭa II, as the only alternative was the occupation of this disintegrating viceroyalty by the Sultan of Bijapur, which would drive a Muhammadan wedge between the territory of Mysore and the dominions of the emperor. That probably explains why Śrīranga appealed first of all to Mysore for assistance and obtained the asylum which he found denied him in the southern viceroyalties—*Ed.*

[56] The alliance between Śrīranga and Mysore, if Tirumala had understood the signs of the times, would not have shown itself to be a combination which boded ill to him. This combination just succeeded in keeping Bijapur out on the side of the Mysore territory and keeping Mysore in touch with the territories of the emperor so that between Ikkēri, Mysore, and the emperor at Vellore there was a front line of defence without overthrowing which Bijapur could not advance against him or Gingi, or, for the matter of that, Tanjore. When once Bijapur had been invited by Madura, and if Gingi co-operated in this invitation actively or passively, there was no reason why the Bijapur army should spare Tanjore. It would be difficult to understand how Tirumala Nāyaka safeguarded his interests by trusting them into the hands of the Sultans of Bijapur, who from the point of view of Tirumala, must sooner or later overthrow the emperor, as they in fact did, and his ally of Tanjore, who was even then

The result of these transactions was the extinction of the kingdom of Vellore, the diminutive representative of the empire of Vijayanagar. Wilks[57] says that Śrīranga Rāya left 'Drauveda' in 1646,[58] and fled to Bednore, and therefore does not take into account his stay in Mysore. Kanṭhīrava Narasa Rāja entertained him for some time, and, seeing that he was the source of further troubles, seems to have left him to his own fate about 1653. According to Jesuit testimony, Śrīranga led a miserable life on the confines of his kingdom. It was probably after this exile that the chief of Bednore gave him asylum, with the idea of furthering, in his name, his own ambitions against Mysore. There is nothing to indicate that it was loyalty to the empire which induced Mysore and Bednore to receive Śrīranga. Their schemes of self-aggrandizement appear to have been the governing motive. An inscription of 1663 at Bellary[59] mentions Śrīranga's gift of a village. Though later inscriptions refer to other Vijayanagar emperors, there seems to be no valid ground for supporting any reality in the claim[60]; even in 1792 and 1793 grants by a Reḍḍi

perhaps actively assisting him. The turn of Mysore and Ikkēri would follow next. Tirumala would then be dependent entirely upon the good faith of Bijapur for his independence. Tirumala must have had the wit to understand that such independence would be worse than subordination to an emperor like Śrīranga and his descendants. If these consequsnces were averted, it was through the advance of the Moghul arms in the Dakhan and the danger that threatened both Bijapur and Golkonda. While therefore Tirumala's policy can be justified as a continuation of that of his predecessors towards the emperor, neither political foresight nor even enlightened self-interest could be urged in support of the particular attitude that he took up as against Śrīranga.—*Ed.*

57 i, p. 36.

58 But R. Orme (*Historical Fragments*, p. 62) remarks that the Muhammadan invasion of the Carnatic took place about 1652.

59 Appendix D, No. 160.

60 The trend of the transactions connected with the final disappearance of Śrīranga III is wrapped up in obscurity. It used to be taken hitherto that 1644 or 1646 was the last date ascribable to Śrīranga, without any satisfactory authority as it would seem. After the open betrayal of his imperial claims by the southern Nāyaks, when they declined to co-operate with him, his position in Vellore must have become precarious; and the invasions by Golkonda of the central regions of the empire must have become more persistent and frequent. It is in the course of these recurring invasions that the fort of Vellore must have been occupied by the Muhammadans, and, according to the account given in the *Śivatatvaratnākaram*, Śivappa Nāyaka's siege of Vellore and its recovery for Śrīranga must have taken place. It is not necessary that Śivappa should have been the ruler at the time. This may have taken place in the reign of his predecessor, Vīrabhadra, in whose reign the older Sivappa, the younger Śivappa, and his brother, Venkaṭa are all three of them said to have carried on the administration on behalf of Vīrabhadra. This period corresponds to the reign of Kanṭhīrava Narasa, who was the first to show himself aggressive on the southern frontier, and his aggres-

chief mention a Venkaṭapati Mahārāya.[61] The disappearance of the Vijayanagar empire was followed by the expansion of the kingdoms of Bijapur and Golkonda farther south. Thevenot[62] remarks that

sions were so far successful that he occupied practically all the Kongu country of Salem and Coimbatore districts and even threatened Trichinopoly itself. It is probable that in this enterprise he had the countenance of the emperor in the first years of his reign. It is an inscription of his reign, dated 1646, that omits mention of the imperial ruler, a sure sign of assumption of independence. It was also Kanṭhīrava Narasa that instituted a systematic and uniform coinage throughout his territory of both higher and lower denominations. He is said to have done it by abolishing the right to coinage that his feudatories hitherto enjoyed. This yet again is another indication of his assumption of independence. Something therefore must have taken place in 1646 or just a little before to have brought about this open disavowal of imperial authority. That event may have been the fall of Vellore, rendering the emperor Śrīranga practically a fugitive without a capital of his own. Kanṭhīrava Narasa's rule extended till 1659. During his reign there is no mention, so far as is known at present, on the Mysore side, of any asylum that Kanṭhīrava Narasa offered to the emperor. It is probable that the emperor was allowed to live in his territory, but the acts of assumption of independent power detailed above would go against the supposition, The fact seems to be that Mysore ruler kept Śrīranga in good humour by the appearance of loyalty as a cover to his aggrrssions in the early years, and threw off the mask soon after. Thus the emperor was a wanderer without a home, as the Jesuit records put it, seems to have been true during the remaining period of the reign of Kanṭhīrava Narasa. It is probable that his aggressions in the latter part of his reign and the hold Mysore attempted to maintain upon her conquests progressing rapidly towards Trichinopoly brought about a change in the situation generally, and in the attitude of the southern viceroys towards the emperor. The battle that was fought at Erode must have taken place about the end of Dēvarāya's reign, as the Mysore accounts state that Chikka dēva, while yet a prince, offered, when negotiations failed, to lead the army to victory. This battle may be dated somewhere about 1670 and was undertaken ostensibly in the interests of the emperor. It may be as a preliminary to this and in view of the aggressive attitude of Mysore that Chokkanātha changed his capital from Madura to Trichinopoly in 1665. Srīranga must have sought asylum with Śivappa Nāyaka only after this. According to the *Śivatatvaratnākaram*, Śivappa received him and gave him the districts of Vēlūr, Hassan, and Śakkarēpaṭṭaṇa and maintained him in his territory. According to the *Chikkadēvarāya Vaṁśāvaḷi*, Śivappa came to occupy the throne of Ikkēri when Chikkadēvaraja Uḍaiyār had been ruling some years already. The date of Chikkadēvarāja's accession is 1672, and Śivappa's may be put down a couple of years later at the most. Śivappa's embassy to Chikkadēvarāja Uḍaiyār must have come in that year's *dasara* or the year following, and therefore 1675 would be about the date when Śrīranga ceased to be a force in South Indian politics, though his titular power continued till his successor Kōdanḍarāma and his forces were overwhelmed in the battle of Hassan, as the *Rāmarājīyamu* has it, some years later. If the coronation of Sivaji had any connection with the disappearance of the empire of Vijayanagar, Śrīranga's death must have taken place earlier than the coronation. At any rate Sivaji must have felt the empire extinct when he undertook his southern invasion which had in it an idea of reviving the Hindu empire of the south. A recently discovered coin of Sivaji in imitation of the Vijayanagar *Pagoḍa* seems to lend colour to such a view.—*Ed.*

61 Sewell, ii, pp. 6-7, Nos. 45 and 46.

62 *Travels*, Part iii. p. 91.

'the King of Golconda seized those (dominions) of the coast of Coromandal, which lay conveniently for him; and the King of Bijapur, having taken what lay next to him, pursued his conquest as far as the Cape of Negapatnam'. Therefore he says[63] that 'the Kingdom of Bijapur is bounded on the south by the country of the Naique of Madura, whose territories reach to the Cape Comory'. The vassalage of Tirumala Nāyaka to Bijapur is disproved by the following observation of Thevenot[64]. 'There are many Naiques to the south of St. Thomas, who are sovereigns. The Naique of Madura is one; he of Tangiour (Tanjore) is at present a vassal to the King of Bijapur.' R. Orme[65] says that in 1652 'the Carnatic was invaded by the armies of Viziapore and Golcondah, acting separately; but agreed, it is supposed, in the objects and division of their conquests, which were accomplished in 1656'.

'The War of the Noses.'—Kanṭhīrava Narasa Rāja, the king of Mysore, was not prepared to leave Tirumala unpunished for the disasters which he brought on him by acting in collusion with Bijapur. The latter's withdrawal from Mysore gave him an opportunity 'to let slip the dogs of war' on Madura. About 1656 the province of Satyamangalam was invaded and the most horrible outrages perpetrated on the inhabitants. Tirumala's power in Salem in 1652 is clear from an inscription at Yerumaipaṭṭi[66]. An inscription at Erode,[67] dated 1655-6, of Kanṭhīrava Narasa mentions Daḷavāy Hampaiya in connection with Madura. Probably the latter was entrusted with the conduct of this invasion. The Mysore general was encouraged by the facility of his progress to march close to Madura itself with a view to capture it. Wherever he went he is said to have executed the barbarous orders of his master by cutting off the noses of all who fell into his hands, not excluding even women and children, and sending them to Mysore. It appears that it was this alleged barbarity which won notoriety for the Mysore army's methods of warfare. J. H. Grose[68] refers to the 'singular methods of the Mysore troops' and their 'particular dexterity in cutting off noses'. In the Fort St. George resolution of January, 1679,[69] a reference is made to this practice.

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 92.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[65] *Historical Fragments*, p. 62.

[66] Appendix D, No. 143.

[67] *Ibid.*, No. 146.

[68] A *Voyage to the East Indies*, p. 247.

[69] J.T. Wheeler, *Madras in the Olden Time*, i.p. 104.

Tirumala Nāyaka was on his sick-bed, and naturally he must have been very much perplexed. He communicated with his faithful vassal, Raghunātha Sētupati, whose timely and effective help saved Madura from danger. The latter instantly brought together an army 25,000 Maravas and defended the capital with the co-operation of 35,000 troops, collected under the orders of Tirumala.[70] In a short time, the Mysore army was driven back to the borders of the Dindigul province. The attempts of the Mysore general to delay the decision were fruitless. A pitched battle was fought, and it is said that each side lost about 12,000 men. The courage of the Sētupati made Madura victorious, and the Mysore army retired baffled. Tirumala Nāyaka honoured him with the title of Tirumalai Sētupati, showered the choicest gifts on him, and cancelled his tribute altogether.

The *History of the Carnataca Governors* gives the whole credit for saving Madura from the Mysore invasion to the Sētupati. The Jesuit letters confirm this view.[71] Further, they speak of a counter-invasion of Mysore by the Madura army, but the leader of this aggressive campaign is not mentioned. Some *Mackenzie Manuscripts*[72] describe an expedition to Mysore towards the close of Tirumala's reign, under the command or Kumāra Muttu, the king's younger brother, and Rangaṇṇa Nāyaka. They attribute the repulse of the Mysore invasion also to the former. In any case, it is clear that the Mysoreans were hotly pursued to their capital; and much damage was done. The strange form of cruelty practised in Madura by the Mysore army was now repeated in Mysore; and it is said that even the king of Mysore lost his nose.[73] The Madura army seems to have penetrated as far as Nanjanakuḍi (Nanjangud). Before the completion of this raid, Tirumala Nāyaka died.

70 Mr. Rangachari accepts the statement of the *History of the Carnataca Governors* that he came with 60,000 troops, but this number is the total of the Madura army including the Sētupati's.

71 Bertrand, iii, pp. 48-50. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 1.

72 Taylor, *O.H. MSS.*, ii, pp. 175 and 182-3.

73 The 'war of the noses' obviously took place in the last year of the reign of Kanṭhīrava Narasa and of Tirumala Nāyaka of Madura. The feature of the cutting off of the noses is not mentioned in connection with any other Mysore war, either with the Pāṇḍyas or with other powers. What exactly was the motive for this barbarity it is not possible to make out now. It would be difficult to throw doubt upon it in face of the combined evidence of several of the foreign authorities. There seems to have been a special reason for this particular form of barbarity, which used to be inflicted as a punishment in individual cases, where a particularly dis-disgraceful method of punishment was called for, not on the field of battle, however. The improbability of the story is heightened by the statement of one of the

As was remarked before, the existence of a younger brother of Tirumala is not sufficiently proved. Though the *History of the Carnataca Governors* mentions him in its genealogical list, it has nothing to say about his part in the Mysore war. The Sētupati is mentioned prominently both by this chronicle and the Jesuit records. Inscriptions refer only to a Kumāra Muttu Tirumala, son of Tirumala Nāyaka. His Tiruchchengōḍu grant of 1659 and his father's gift for his merit in the same year[74] lend support to his having taken part in the Mysore campaign.

The Portuguese and the Dutch.—The attitude of Tirumala Nāyaka towards the Europeans of the sea-coast does not seem to have been decided. Probably he remained neutral in the fierce contest between the Portuguese and the Dutch. In 1635 a Portuguese fleet arrived at Tuticorin to 'punish the Naique of Madura, and to overawe the Jesuits there; the former having seized, at the instance of the latter, a Portuguese agent who had been sent to purchase saltpetre in exchange for elephants'.[75] In the war with the Sētupati, we have seen that Tirumala Nāyaka received the help of the Portuguese and that, in grateful recognition of this service, he granted them certain concessions in his kingdom, promising to assist them in Ceylon and treat the Dutch as his enemies. In February, 1646, the king of Portugal sent instructions to his Indian viceroy to persuade the native rulers to fight against the Dutch. Accordingly Tirumala Nāyaka turned the Dutch out of Paṭṭaṇam in 1648. To avenge this insult, the latter returned with ten vessels about the 10th of February, 1649, and commenced hostile operations. They captured the *pagoda* of Trichendur and fortified it strongly. Then they marched to Tuticorin, and demanded payment of a penalty for the alleged intrigues of the Paravas with the Nāyak of Madura, and the consequent expulsion of the Dutch factor from Paṭṭaṇam. Since no responses

authorities that the king of Mysore himself suffered this mutilation. This in itself is very unlikely, and, if such a thing had happened, there would have been some mention of it on the Mysore side as well. The truth appears to be that this peculiar form of punishment was meted out, by the Mysore army, to a certain number of people for some act of treachery by the enemies of Mysore either in the fighting line or among the civil population. There may have been a rebellion as well, but neither this nor the punishment can have been on the scale that the accounts lead us to infer, as we have come upon nothing peculiar in the Mysore troops, either before or after to justify our ascribing this particular form of barbarity, as a habitual feature, to the Mysore army as a whole. Ferishta mentions an instance of similar barbasity when the Golkonda troops laid siege to Bidar.—*Ed.*

[74] Appendix D. Nos. 152 and 151.

[75] Danvers. *Report*, pp. 52-3; *The Portuguese in India*, ii, p. 250.

came, the town was sacked and partly burned. After removing whatever they could get at, and wresting from the Paravas a written promise to pay a fixed sum, they left the place on the 13th of February and carried even the fishing boats along with them.[76] In 1658 the Dutch captured Tuticorin from the Portuguese. It is clear from these events that Tirumala Nāyaka left the coast region to the European nations and was satisfied with the tribute they paid.

Missionary Activities.—In 1624 the Madura mission entered a new stage in its progress. Robert de Nobili learned much from his experience in Madura. Till now all his activities had been confined to the town and the territory of Madura. From this time an era of expansion to the north began. The chief reason for this change was the almost insurmountable obstacles to conversion that Madura offered. Further, the prospect of 'new centres of action radiating the light of the Gospel to a larger sphere' indicated the necessity for a move to the north. Moreover, the political atmosphere was so tense that persecution was sure to follow, and, in times of trouble, the new residences would afford refuge for Christians. With these objects, de Nobili left Madura in June, 1623, and his inveterate objection to concern himself with people other than Brahmans gradually wore away. As Trichinopoly was in great agitation, he travelled to Śēndamangalam. He was solemnly received by Rāmachandra Nāyaka, a tributary of the Nāyak of Madura. With the idea of returning to this place in a short time, he left for Salem, the capital of Sālapaṭṭi Nāyaka, another ruler subordinate to Madura. Contrary to all expectations, he found it 'a cruel and inhospitable shore'. Some time after, the brother of the Nāyak became his disciple, and the situation improved in his favour. The chief himself was much impressed with his greatness, and he showed him much kindness and respect. Nobili was accused by some as a *Parangi*, driven out from Madura. But the protection of the Nāyak of Salem gave him every facility for work. After his return from Cochin in 1625, where he had been called by his superiors, Nobili tried to exploit for his own purpose the political differences between the Chief of Salem and the neighbouring rulers. But much did not come out of these intrigues.[77] The illness of Antonio Vico called him back to the south. Entrusting Martinz with his labours, Nobili started for Madura in 1627; but, when he reached Trichinopoly, he was told that Vico was steadily improving. He took advantage of his stay

[76] Danvers, *Report*, pp. 48-50; *The Portuguese in India*, ii, pp. 293-4.

[77] Letters of Vico, dated 1624 and 1625; Bertrand, ii, pp. 225-51

in the latter place to organize Christianity[78]. Till about this time the activities of the Madura mission were carried on smoothly by Nobili in the north and by Vico in the south. The latter's letter of 1626[79] speaks of the 'conquests' in the environs of Madura.

Soon after Nobili commenced his work in Trichinopoly in 1627 he was menaced, as he says, with expulsion and imprisonment by the orders of the Nāyak. As most of the letters written during this period (1627-38) are lost, the details of the events are not available. Vico's letter of November, 1632[80] refers to violent persecutions during several years, especially in 1630. Perhaps these events synchronized with the first war of Tirumala Nāyaka with Mysore. The wars with Travancore and the Sētupati may have lengthened this period of storm. In 1638 Nobili went to Madura. After the death of Vico in October, he felt obliged to go to Cochin to enrol new workers. Soon after his return, the missionaries in Madura and Trichinopoly, including himself, were arrested and imprisoned. But thispersecution did not last long. Within a year Martinz wrote from Trichinopoly that the Divine Providence had 'chained the winds of persecution', and that families were being converted wholesale. This change may have been due to the promise of Tirumala Nāyaka to the Portuguese viceroy on the 13th of August, 1639, to allow freedom for intending converts to Christianity[81] There was persecution again in 1640.[82] On the 17th of January, 1644, the governor of Trichinopoly gave orders to the same effect.[83] Nobili made up his mind to interview Tirumala Nāyaka himself. He succeedeed in his attempt, with the result that he was greatly honoured by the latter, and a general order was issued allowing the missionaries freedom of action in their work and restoring to them all their belongings.[84] This seems to have been his last active work in the cause of Christianity. In 1648 he was removed to Jaffnapatam for considerations of health and later on to Mylapore (Madras). Even during these days of retirement his mental activity did not cease, and he never gave up his literary pursuits till his death in 1660.

After the retirement of Nobili, persecution did not altogether come to a close, though it is clear that Tirumala Nāyaka adhered to the prin-

[78] Nobili's letter of 1627; *Ibid*, pp. 261-71.

[79] *Ibid.*, pp. 251-61.

[80] Bertrand. ii, pp. 271-80.

[81] *Ante*, p. 123.

[82] Bertrand, ii. p. 309.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 346.

[84] *Ibid* p. 351.

ciple of toleration embodied in his order of 1644. Balthazar Da Costa says in his letter of 1653[85] :—'Our enemies are so numerous and implacable that the good-will of the Nāyak of Madura is not sufficient to protect us from their frequent molestation. For this reason, and to be ready with a place of shelter in times of religious persecution or political warfare, we have established a Church and Presbytery at Candelour . . . We find more security and freedom in the administration of the Paraiyas, far from the proud castes of the Hindus.' It is said that in 1653 a provincial governor gave the signal for persecution by arresting a Christian. Provoked beyond endurance by the resistance of the Christians, he ordered a general persecution in all the villages of his province. On the first news of violence, Father Alvarez went to the governor-general of Trichinopoly, who administered very severe reprimands to the subordinate governor. Da Costa, then at Madura, visited the Nāyak, who received his complaints favourably and issued thundering letters against the transgressors of his orders. The enemies of Christianity were frightened, and they gave up their campaign.[86] Proenza's letter of 1659 speaks of the recrudescence of persecution. 'The public calamities afforded them (persecutors) a new and very effective argument to place before the governors.'[87] Alvarez was imprisoned, but was released on the orders of the Governor-General of Trichinopoly. The missionaries were banished from the whole province of Trichinopoly. Da Costa went to Madura to address the Nāyak in person. After many difficulties he obtained an audience with him. The Nāyak gave him a kind reception, and issued definite orders for the restoration to the missionaries of all that they had been deprived of, and for their full liberty in the churches they had built and wherever they were pleased to settle. He dismissed him finally with many costly presents. The orders were executed by the governor of Trichinopoly.[88] These events happened at some time between 1650 and 1659. Tirumala Nāyaka's intentions could not always be given full effect to owing to the strong representations of his subjects to their local rulers. Hence his constant intervention on behalf of the missionaries was necessary. Sometimes he could not control the fury of his people, and he had to connive at their actions. However strong he might be, he was not prepared to flout public opinion.

[85] Bertrand, iii. pp. 9-10.

[86] *Ibid.*, pp. 15-7.

[87] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[88] Bertrand, iii, pp. 56-60.

On the whole, the attitude of Tirumala Nāyaka towards Christianity was sympathetic. Proenza goes even further and says[89] that he loved and protected the Christian religion. In times of internal commotion and foreign war, Tirumala seems to have put a strong check on the imprudent activities of the missionaries. He did not, however, favour them at the cost of his subjects' loyalty. Stories about his conversion to Christianity are without any foundation. In his dealings with the Christians Tirumala was mainly actuated by the most enlightened principle of freedom of conscience.

Tirumala Nāyaka's Character and Work.—The outstanding feature of Tirumala Nāyaka's character was his courage and persistence as a soldier. When he had capable generals in whom he had perfect confidence, he generally entrusted them with the conduct of war; Rāmappaiya managed the first war with Mysore and the campaign against the Sētupati. He did not yearn for military glory for its own sake. After Rāmappaiya's death we find him actively taking part in the war against the emperor. Undaunted by the betrayal of the Nāyak of Tanjore at the criti cal hour, he diverted the attention of Bijapur to the south and hastened to the relief of Gingi; and, when he found that the latter also proved treacherous to his cause, he fought manfully to the last. The further progress of the Muhammadans he is said to have checked by defeating them and making them fall back on Gingi. Whether he was successful or not, he never lost presence of mind, and never gave up his plans when once they were deliberately formed. The Kūniyūr Plates of Venkata II gave credit to his soldierly qualities in the following expressions: 'The strength of whose arm was hard to be resisted . . . whose enemies ascended high mountains as soon as he ascended (his) mighty elephant, who surpassed the enemy of the ocean (i.e., the submarine fire) in attacking a town for conquest.'[90] There may be some exaggeration in this description, but it cannot be regarded as absolutely false.

Tirumala Nāyaka was a man of very strong religious convictions, and the root of all his architectural activities lay in them. His numerous charities and gifts to temples, set down in his inscriptions and other records, prove his generosity and selflessness. All the resources of the kingdom were utilized for its needs and progress. He was a strong and active ruler with the welfare of his subjects at heart. His tour round his territories is recorded in an inscription.[91]

89 *Ibid.*, p 50, *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No.1.

90 *E.I.*, iii, pp. 236-58.

91 Appendix D, No. 144.

The wars that he waged were only in the interests of his kingdom, and he could not help the sufferings which his subjects had to undergo in consequence. It is outside our province to discuss the ethics of his 'rebellion' against the Vijayanagar emperor. It is not true to say that he fought for a mere name; he was willing to render obeisance to the figure-head of an emperor. One-third of the revenues of the country had to be given as tribute in return for practically no advantages to the kingdom. In the early days of the Nāyakship, subordination and tribute meant safety from foreign aggression and small expenditure on external defence. Now the emperor was powerless to execute his will, and Madura had herself to organize all her defences. Further, Tirumala himself would have pleaded guilty, and said that, if it were a sin to covet independence, he was the most offending soul alive. Therefore the justification for his wars depends on the morality of his ideal. Granting that the real motive of his policy was independence, it is hard to see how he could have avoided the wars and all their evil consequences. To the great credit of Tirumala it must be said that he was always on the defensive in the beginning. Even in the case of the Mysore war, during the closing years of his reign, he ordered the invasion of Mysore only to punish the perpetrators of horrible mutilations and other barbarities. He did not desire annexation of neighbouring territory; he only wanted absolute control in his own dominions, free from external interference. If this desire is praiseworthy, then none of the wars he had to conduct can be said to be exclusively of his making.

Tirumala's ambition went only to the extent of making Madura independent. Hence defence was the first question he had to consider. Most of the frontier forts mentioned in the chronicles seem to have been built by him. He collected an army strong enough to meet any emergency. There was no vacillation in the execution of his plans. If he committed any error of judgment, he was quick at rectifying the error, as in the case of the Ramnad question. He chose capable agents for his work, and seems to have allowed them great freedom of action. He was politic enough to retain their services by constantly humouring them with status and power. The remarkable loyalty of the Sētupati towards the close of his reign was not a little due to his kind and encouraging attitude towards him. He was quick to appreciate loyal and devoted service. To the end of his life Tirumala struggled hard to preserve the integrity of his dominions. But he was not without faults. He did not calculate the cost of his undertakings. For his persistency the subjects had to pay dearly. His wars were exhausting enough to weaken the resources of the kingdom. His plans required able successors to

consolidate the advantages secured. Though he only followed precedent from South Indian politics in calling the Muhammadans to his help, the latter exploited the weakness of some of his successors to the greatest detriment of the kingdom.

The most enduring monument of Tirumala's greatness is his contribution to art and architecture. This subject has been dealt with elaborately by experts like James Fergusson (*History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*), and does not strictly belong to political history. Tirumala's attention in this direction was mostly, if not exclusively, confined to the town of Madura and its environs. All the surplus revenues of the kingdom were diverted into this channel with unremitting care. His public works were on such a large scale that there were practically no labour problems to trouble him. Besides numerous *pagoḍas* and *gōpuras*, his 'choultry' and palace are wonderful creations of artistic genius. These buildings struck the Jesuit observers so much that they had to run for a parallel to the ancient monuments of Thebes.

The greatness of Tirumala Nāyaka is writ large in tradition, and, to some extent, in the architectural survivals of the present day. In the Jesuit records of their respective ages, Tirumala and Akbar figure almost alike; there is grudging acknowledgment of merit, perhaps due to their lukewarm attitude towards Christianity. The former is said to have possessed 'great qualities', but lost them towards the very close of his life. Probably this is an attack on his last wars. But, as was remarked before, Tirumala was not wholly to blame for undertaking them. Unsullied success rarely goes with greatness. Tirumala was great, at least in the sense that Louis XIV was one of the greatest sovereigns of Europe. The remarkable identity of the dates given by most of the chronicles with regard to his reign, while they give very divergent dates with regard to the other rulers they deal with, perhaps reflects the estimate which the people had of his memorable reign. A Jesuit letter of January, 1709,[92] says that, on the death of Tirumala, a temple was erected, and he was worshipped. There is no doubt that Tirumala Nāyaka left a strong impression on the minds of his subjects and contemporaries. As Dr. Vincent A. Smith says of Akbar, Tirumala's defects can only be regarded as 'spots on the sun'.

Mr. Rangachari begins his account of Tirumala Nāyaka's reign with an almost complete condemnation of his character and work.[93]

[92] Lockman, ii, p. 379.

[93] *I A.*, 1916, p. 149, *et seq. passim*

He employs some violent phrases to express his opinions on them. He thinks that Tirumala, far from being 'the greatest of his dynasty', was a traitor of the blackest dye. He speaks of his 'absolute worthlessness as a soldier, stateman or politician' and his 'suicidal treachery': he says that he was 'the evil genius of his time', a 'political iconoclast', and 'the political vandal' . . . 'who knew neither honour nor patriotism, and worshipped expediency and selfishness alone'; and concludes that he 'betrayed his religion and his country besides sacrificing his conscience and his reputation',[94] and that 'in the end, he did not only himself become a slave, both in fact and in theory, but made the other Hindu kings of the south slaves of the despised Mlēchcha.'[95] These remarks do not come to the level of sober criticism, and it is useless to consider them *seriatim*. A general answer is embodied in the account of Tirumala Nāyaka so far given. But Mr. Rangachari does not seem to mean what he says, as appears from the following passages: 'The praises of chronicles, the exploits of kings like Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa, the works of Tirumal Nāik and Mangammāḷ are even now existing proofs of a prosperous kingdom and a resourceful people.'[96] 'No sovereign of the Madura line, except Viśvanātha I and Tirumal Nāik, has gained such a lasting remembrance in the memory of mankind (as Mangmmāḷ).'[97] 'Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa endeavoured to retrieve the losses sustained by his father, to restore and re-establish a settled government, and to extent the *name and extent of Madura* to what they were *in the time of Tirumal Nāik*.'[98] Mr. Rangachari's statement that Tirumala Nāyaka was the 'slave' of Bijapur is inconsistent with the following observation of his: 'The Sultan of Bijapur had been for the previous thirty years (1660-89) the suzerian (of Madura).'[99] Writing in 1678, André Freire refers to the 'kingdom (of Madura), so powerful twenty year ago.'[100]

Tirumala's Death.—Nelson[101] refers to proenza's letter of 1659, and says: 'It seems to hint at a sudden death.' The statement referred to is as follows: 'Tirumala Nāyaka had not the time to enjoy this

94 *Ibid.*, p. 186.

95 *Ibid.*, p. 199.

96 *I.A.*, 1916, p. 54.

97 *Ibid.*, 1971, p. 156.

98 *Ibid.*, p. 158.

99 *Ibid.*, p. 158.

100 Bertrand, iii, p. 273.

101 p. 141,

victory.'[102] But this does not seem to lend itself to such an inference. The various concocted stories about the nature of Tirumala's death are given by Nelson and elaborately discussed by Mr. Ragachari. The latter's conclusion, pedantically expressed, can be accepted: 'The theory of priestly villainy and Christian martyrdom is thus a pure myth, not history; a creation of the imagination, not a substantial fact.'[103] 'If the theory of apostacy and murder is incredible, that of love intrigue is equally so.' But Mr. Rangachari cannot resist the conclusion that 'Tirumal Naik must have died a sudden death.' He even guesses the nature of his fatal end as a sudden indisposition.'[104]

There is no real evidence to show that Tirumala met with a sudden death. A *Mackenzie Manuscripts*[105] puts the following words into the mouth of Tirumala: 'The Mysoreans, knowing that we are sick, have availed themselves of the opportunity to invade our royal domains.' The following observation of Lēon Besse[106] throws further light on the matter: 'About the same time (1655) Tirumala Nāyaka escaped the dagger of an assassin, disguised as a woman and hiding in the palace unnoticed for three days. A little after, his life was endangered again by an abscess on the head.' Thus there was some room for the fabrication of store retailing his murder or sudden death. That he was ill for a long time before his death is clear from the chronicles also. Under these circumstances the statement of Proenza can only be taken to mean that Tirumala died before the return of his successful army from Mysore.

The date of his death is 4th Māśi, Viḷambi (about the 16th of February, 1659), according to the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts*, *Maduraittalavaralāṛu* and the *Pāndyan Chronicle*, The *History of the Carnataca Governors* and the *Supplementary Manuscript* take it to Plava, i.e. 1661-2. This latter view is contradicted by Jesuit evidence and some inscriptions. The letter of Proenza ascribes it to 1659. From it, it is also clear that Tirumala's death took place early in that year; for the definite date, 19th March, 1659, is assigned to the attack of the Muhammadans on Tanjore, after their army had appeared before Trichinopoly and taken note of the serious preparations of Muttu

[102] Bertrand, iii, p. 50. *Vide* Appendix A. Letter No. 1.

[103] *I.A.*, 1917 p. 28.

[104] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

[105] Taylor, *O.H. MSS.*, ii, p. 182.

[106] *La Mission du Maduré*, p. 205.

Vīrappa, Tirumala's successor, for war.[107] The last inscription of Tirumala is in Viḷambi (1658-9) at Tiruchengōḍu,[108] and there is an inscription of Chokkanātha, Muttu Vīrappa's successor, in 1661.[109] Therefore the date of Tirumala Nāyaka's death, according to the first set of chronicles, viz., about the 16th of February, 1659, may be accepted as correct.

The total duration of Tirumala's reign is thirty-six years, according to the majority of chronicles; the letter of Proenza gives only thirty years. This question is intimately connected with the date of Tirumala's accession, about which there are some difficulties, as already detailed. The same Jesuit letter says that Tirumala died in his seventyfifth year. Telson's view is vague and even contradictory. He remarks that Tirumala was between thirty and forty when he succeeded to the throne in 1623,[110] and that he was between sixty and seventy when he died in 1659 after a reign of thirty-six years.[111] But he does not give his authority for this statement.

107 Bertrand, iii, p. 51. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 1.

108 Appendix D, No. 151.

109 *Ibid.*, No. 156.

110 p. 121.

111 p. 139.

Chapter IX

MUTTU VĪRAPPA NĀYAKA II

(1659)

According to the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts*, Muttu Vīrappa ruled from the 5th Māśi of the year Viḷambi to Vaikāśi of Vikāri (approximately from the 17th of February to June, 1659); i.e., for about four months. The *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle* and the *Maduraittalavaralāṟu* give his reign-period as from Panguni, Viḷambi to Vaikāśi, Vikāri (March to June, 1659), i.e., about three months. All these chronicles, therefore, agree with regard to the final month of his reign; there is not much differencc between them as to the initial date. Perhaps the date of coronation is given by the last two authorities, which leave an intervel of nearly a month between the death of Tirumala and the accession of Muttu Vīrappa. The *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts* make the latter event follow the former in closesuccession. The Jesuit letters are not specific with regard to Muttu Vīrappa's dates; they only say that he ruled for a very short time. Inscriptions only give the information that he was the son of Tirumala and the father of Chokkanātha. A period of ten years given to his reign by the *History of the Carnataca Governors* and the *Supplementary Manuscript* is opposed to the evidence of inscriptions and the Jesuit letters. There seems to be no ground for supposing that Muttu Vīrappa was the illegitimate son of Tirumala Nāyaka, as Nelson takes him to be.[1] He does not support his opinion. The chronicles do not refer to his illegitimacy; they speak of him as the son of Tirumala.[2] A Jesuit letter that says that his character changed for the worse towards the close of his reign, not only does not cast any doubt on the legitimacy of his birth but speaks of him as the worthy son of Tirumala Nayaka.[3] The existence of a legitimate son to Tirumala is proved by inscriptions.[4]

The interval, allowed by the *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle*, between the death of Tirumala and the accession of Muttu Vīrappa, may have

[1] pp. 178 and 253.

[2] Taylor, *O.H.MSS.*, ii, pp. 33 and 183.

[3] Bertrand, iii, p. 121. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 2.

[4] Appendix D. Nos. 151 and 152.

been occupied with the dispute about the succession alluded to in some *Mackenzie Manuscripts.*[5] As mentioned before, there is some obscurity about Kumāra Muttu's relationship to Tirumala Nāyaka.[6] He is said to have been very much offended at his claims to the throne being passed over by the people and the ministers. After his victorious return from Mysore, he camped near Madura. Negotiations proceeded, and, according to the chronicles, a peaceful understanding came through the mediation of Rangaṇṇa Nāyaka. Kumāra Muttu was given independent charge of Śivakāśi and some other places in Tinnevelly; and, handing over charge of his army, he retired to his domains. This attitude of voluntary self-effacement on the part of a general, just returned from his successful campaign, probably confirms the fact that Muttu Vīrappa was the legitimate successor of Tirumala Nāyaka. Ambition may have been knocked out of Kumāra Muttu by saner counsels. If he was not the brother of Tirumala, he may have been his illegitimate son.

Shortly after his accession Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka strengthened the fort of Trichinopoly, the key of his northern dominions, by equipping it with soldiers and munitions, and entrusting it to the command of Lingama Nāyaka. He was prepared to show a bold front to the Muhammadans in case they invaded his kingdom. He urged the Nāyak of Tanjore in vain to join him. The latter commenced negotiations with Bijapur, which were not heeded. Soon 'Idal Khan' (the Adil Shah) sent a large army under 'Sagosi' and 'Mula' with the object of conquering the dominions of the Nāyaks. Terrified by the preparations of Muttu Vīrappa, the Muhammadan generals withdrew from Trichinopoly and suddenly surprised Tanjore by attacking it on the 19th of March, 1659. Though they were ill-provided with artillery, and the citadel was strongly defended, the cowardice of its commander secured them an easy victory. The fall of Tanjore was followed by that of the other important towns of Mannārkōvil and Vallam, which surrendered after some resistance. The Muhammadans were disappointed in their booty, as most of it had been carried away by the *Kaḷḷans.* They left a garrison at Vallam and spread over the country.[7] There seems to be no evidence that they 'marched as far as Madura', as Nelson thinks.[8] It is said that a famine resulted from the Muhammadan invasion, and people took refuge in Madura and Satyamangalam. The Muhammadans *themselves*

[5] Taylor, *O.H.MSS.*, ii, pp. 177 and 183-4.

[6] *Ante*, p. 71.

[7] Bertrand, iii, pp. 50-3. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 1.

[8] p. 180.

suffered much from it and lost many men and horses. Since they did not bury the dead bodies, their putrefaction caused the outbreak of a pestilence, which increased the mortality. To crown all, the generals and officers of the Muhammadan army quarrelled among themselves. 'Mula', reduced to this distressing poisition, tried negotiations with the Nāyaks of Madura and Tanjore. The former was confident of his strength, and the latter had nothing more to lose. Both of them realized full well the adverse circumstances under which the Muhammadans were labouring. Hence Mula's overtures failed to evoke any response. Compelled to lease Tanjore by famine and contagion, he besieged Trichinopoly with the pick of his troops. He soon realized that his task was far above his resources. Neither stratagem nor force could break through the perfect organization of the fort. Further he found no profit in plundering the country. Bands of *Kaḷḷans* wrought considerable havoc in his camp, and he could not successfully deal with this elusive enemy. A Jesuit writer observes,[9] 'In times of war, a company of these brave men was worth an army. It is certain that the Musalmans during their invasion feared these thieves (*Kaḷḷans*) much more than the king's armies. None is so capable of a *coup de main* as they. Mula's misfortunes only increased with the lapse of time; and, therefore, he gave up his fruitless attempt, on receiving a moderate sum of money from the Nāyak of Madura.

Thus the courage and endurance of Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka at last bore fruit. He bought peace at a very cheap price. Soon after this victory he died. His short reign was one continuous struggle with the Muhammadans. It is difficult to judge how far the Jesuit view of the deterioration of his character is true. It admits his superiority to his father at the commencement of his reign, but maintains that he afterwards became a confirmed debauchee, and that his want of moderation ended fatally.[11] The chronicles say that he was liberal in gifts of charity, and that the 'neighbouring kings were in awe of him'.[12] They therefore confirm his warlike attitude towards the Muhammadans.

[9] Bertrand, iii, p. 184-5.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 119-20. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 2.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 121.

[12] Taylor, *O.H.MSS.*, ii, p. 190

Chapter X

CHOKKANĀTHA NĀYAKA

(1659—1682)

Accession.—According to the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts*, Chokkanātha ruled from Āni, Vikāri (July, 1659) to Āni, Dundubhi (July, 1682). The *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle* gives exactly the same months and years, but puts the total reign-period as twenty-four years, whereas it comes only to about twenty-three years. This dating, though not confirmed, is not opposed to the evidence of the Jesuit letters and inscriptions. In this connection Mr. Rangachari gives the same dates, viz. 1669-82, though the authorities he cites do not lead to this conclusion, perhaps owing to their not being carefully quoted or interpreted. His attempt at epigraphical confirmation for the initial date of Chokkanātha is not satisfactory. He refers to an inscription dated 27th Ani, Parābhava, in the Jayantīśvara temple at Trichinopoly, which he takes as belonging to 1659, but does not quote the reference. Nor does he include it in his *Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency*, published in 1919. It may be that it is his own discovery. Even then, the cyclic year Parābhava corresponds to 1666-7.[1] Mr. Rangachari gives different dates to Chokkanātha in his later publication referred to above. In one place it is said that he ruled from 1660 to 1680 (probably a printer's error for 1682);[2] in another place he says that Chokkanātha 'reigned from 1660 to 1682'.[3] It is not unlikely that he revised his opinion, though he does not say so explicitly. Nelson does not give the date of Chokkanātha's accession. Sewell, who relies on him for almost all his information about the Madura Nāyaks, however, ascribes it to 1660.[4]

Chokkanātha's Early Years.—Chokkanātha ascended the throne when he was only sixteen years old. Naturally, the principal officers assumed real power and ruled the country in his name. The Pradhāni, the Rāyasam, and the Daḷavāy apparently formed a cabal, and removed, by exile or imprisonment, all those who seemed

[1] *I.A.*, 1917, p. 40, *n.*
[2] *I.M.P.*. i, p. 562.
[3] *Ibid.*, ii, p. 1010.
[4] ii, pp. 200 and 202.

dangerous to their interests. To avoid public scrutiny of their usurpation and as a blind to their real objects, they conceived the ambitious scheme of an offensive war against the Muhammadans to re-establish the old political order of things; and entrusted Daḷavāy Lingama Nāyaka, one of the trio, with the carrying out of the scheme. It is not likely that Chokkanātha took any part in initiating this impracticable programme. Accordingly, the Daḷavāy proceeded with an army of 40,000 to drive 'Sagosi' from Gingi and take possession of it. His military reputation was so great that none could suspect the motive of this coalition of ministers. True to their plan, Lingama protracted the campaign and enriched himself with bribes ftom the Muhammadan general. Thus the usurpers enjoyed absolute power, and filled their coffers by oppressing the people. Expecting a bold move on the part of Chokkanātha, they rigorously regulated his freedom and confined him to his place with due honours. When the young king chafed at their leash, they hatched a plot to dethrone him and put his younger brother in his place. With the connivance of Lingama they summarily dealt with the loyal adherents of the prince and put them out of the way. Chokkanātha was let into this secret by a lady of the court; and he exhibited a courage and resourcefulness far above his age. He skilfully negotiated with two of his trusted lieutenants, who were then in exile, and gave them the cue to nip the conspiracy in the bud. With startling rapidity they discharged their duty; the Rāyasam was murdered, and the Brahman Pradhāni blinded. Chokkanātha became free, and lost no time in rallying his partisans around him. He did not feel strong enough to punish Lingama Nāyaka openly for his disloyalty; he concealed his anger in a show of friendship. When at last he decided to deal with him severely, the wily general got scent of his plans and made a speedy escape. Lingama joined 'Sagosi' and persuaded him to besiege Trichinopoly. Accordingly, with an army of 12,000 infantry and 7,000 cavalry and with assurances from the Nāyak of Tanjore, they endeavoured with confidence to meet Chokkanātha's 50,000 men. The young king did not notice a flaw in his arrangement. The new Pradhāni was of the same pattern as his predecessor, and he did not scruple to foil his master's plans. His sympathies were entirely with the enemy, and he worked so cleverly that most of the leaders on the king's side lost their lives or fell into the enemy's hands. This treachery was taken advantage of by Lingama Nāyaka to attempt to seize Chokkanātha and depose him. At last the young king realized his folly and made haste to repair the harm done. He boldly assumed the command of his army and put forth vigorous efforts. His character and energy strengthened his cause, and numerous recruits flocked to his standard.

Desertions from the enemy's camp became frequent. Lingama and 'Sagosi' lost heart and withdrew to Tanjore. Gradually Chokkanātha's self-confidence increased, and with an army of more than 70,000, he marched against Tanjore. The two generals hurriedly retreated to *Gingi*, and the Nāyak of Tanjore made an abject surrender.[5]

Though Chokkanātha, and his father before him, struggled manfully to stem the tide of the Muhammadan deluge, and though Trichinopoly, the nerve-centre of the kingdom, was not lost, the country suffered unspeakable misery for three or four years. Tanjore suffered more than Madura; the people abandoned their homes and took refuge in Madura and some at St. Thome. The excessive and fatal relgious zeal of Vijayarāghava made him culpably negligent of his subjects' sufferings. To all the mishaps due to the Muhammadan scourge and famine was added the inhuman exploitation of the situation by the Dutch, prompted by mercenary motives. A Jesuit writer pathetically describes their atrocities[6]: 'Shame, eternal shame to the Dutch, who cruelly speculated on the misery of the Indians! They enticed them to the coast by the bait of abundant food; then, when their number became pretty large and their strength a little recouped, they piled them up in their ships and transforted them to other countries to be sold as salves!' To some slight extent, relief was given by Chokkanātha to the starving; he issued orders to feed them irrespective of the locality from which they came, and he himself moved from Madura to Trichinopoly to supervise, this work of charity.[7] But public calamities were too numerous and severe to be amenable to human control. Extraordinary events are described as having happened in the kingdom of Madura in 1662.[8] Terrible havoc was done to life and villages; several children were born with teeth fully cut; strange insects vitiated the atmosphere, and people died in large numbers without exhibiting any symptoms of illness. These incidents, most of them probably the result of war and epidemic, worked on the superstitious imagination of the people, who saw in these portents the shadows of greater misfortunes in store for them.

The interval of nominal peace for the country was not of long duration. About 1663 a Bijapur army under the command of

5 Bertrand, iii, pp. 121-3. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 2.

6 Bertrand, iii, pp. 124-5.

7 *Ibid.*, pp. 129-30.

8 *Ibid.*, pp. 155-6.

'Vanamian', the renowned captain of 'Idal Khan', came to Trichinopoly. There was panic everywhere. The only redeeming feature in the situation was the confidence which the people had in Chokkanātha's courage and wisdom. The Muhammadan general tried at first to frighten the Nāyak into submission by displaying his resources, but was disappointed. His attempts to storm the fort were of no avail, as the artillery of the besieged could not be silenced. His lossess were so great that he was compelled to raise the siege. But he succeeded in completely destroying the suburbs and ruining the surrounding country. The crops were destroyed, villages burnt, and their inhabitants ill-treated and captured to be made slaves. To avoid this dishonour, many are said to have put an end to their own lives *en masse* by gathering together in a house and setting fire to it, and in other ways. After pillaging the country to the utmost of his ability, 'Vanamian' persuaded the Nāyak of Madura to pay him a large sum of money as a condition of his leaving the kingdom.[9]

By thus buying off the Muhammadans, Chokkanātha gained the opportunity he yearned for to wreak vengeance on Vijayarāghava of Tanjore for betraying him and co-operating with his enemy. He marched with a strong army to Tanjore and captured Vallam. Soon he was able to dictate terms to his enemy. He garrisoned Vallam and returned to his kingdom.[10] Referring to the events of 1664, Nieuhoff[11] makes the following remarks: 'The Nāyak of Madure had been for a considerable time in war with the Nayk of Tanjaor and taken many places from him; at my time the war was renewed with more vigour than ever; and the Nayk of Tanjaor having gathered a great army attacked the Nayk of Madure so briskly that he took from him in a few days all the places he had conquered from him before. The army of the Nayk of Madure being much disheartened by the victories of their enemies, the Madure sent to me to Koylang his Chief Governor, desiring assistance from the company (Dutch); but, as it was not our interest to engage on any side, I excused it as handsomely as I could.' Perhaps Chokkanātha's occupation of Vallam was only for a short time. Proenza's letter of 1665[12] speaks of Nāyak of Tanjore as having been 'defeated and fleeced by Śokkalinga, whom he had notoriously betrayed'.

9 Bertrand, iii. pp. 156-9. *Vide* Appendlx A, Letter No. 3.

10 *Ibid.*, pp. 159-60. *Vide ibid.*

11 p. 297, *Vide* Appendix C.

12 Bertrand, iii, pp. 164-5.

The next campaign of Chokkanātha was against the Sētupati, who is said to have refused him help when the Muhammadans invaded the kingdom. It is likely that Tirumalai Sētupati, who was exempted from tribute and highly honoured by Tirumala Nāyaka, thought too much of his status to be a loyal subordinate of the young king, and to co-operate with him in his undertakings. But Chokkanātha was bent on punishing him for his disaffection. He did not allow the ardour of his victorious army to cool. Without waiting for a moment, he entered the Marava country and captured the important forts of Tiruppattūr, Pudukottai, Mānāmadurai, and Kāḷaiyārkōvil. Undaunted by these losses, the Sētupati persisted in guerilla tactics, withdrew to his impenetrable forests, and avoided any open engagement with the enemy. Chokkanātha soon grew disgusted with this dilatory warfare. He had, moreover, to celebrate some religious festivals in his capital. So he entrusted the further conduct of operations to some of his generals and returned to Madura. In a short time the scales were turned against him. Intimate local knowledge, combined with skill in fighting in such a country as Ramnad, gave the advantage to the Maravas. 'Chokkanātha, plunged in deep grief by the news of the shameful defeats which his captains had sustained in the Marava country, was not receiving any visit.'[13] He had reluctantly to give up the idea of chastizing his vassal and satisfy himself with retaining possession of some of the important forts in the Marava country.[14]

Change of Capital.—Nelson[15] thinks that Chokkanātha's "first act was to move the Court from Madura to Trichinopoly'. But is borne out neither by the Jesuit letters nor by any other extant source of information. Proenza's letter of 1662 refers to Chokkanātha's leaving Madura for Trichinopoly to organise famine relief.[16] His letter of 1665 says that he went to Madura to request an audience with the great Nāyak.[17] Further on, it explicity states that, 'towards the close of this year (1665), the Nāyak fixed his court at Trichinopoly'.[18] Nieuhoff[19] says that in 1664, 'the capital city and ordinary residences of the Nayk is Madure'. From these references it is clear that Chokkanātha removed his capital to Trichinopoly more than six years after the commencement of his reign.

13 Bertrand. iii, p. 182.

14 *Ibid.*, p. 160. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 3.

15 p. 182.

16 Bertrand, iil, p. 129.

17 *Ibid.*, pp. 181-2

18 *Ibid.*, pp. 182.

19 p. 296. *Vide* Appendix C.

The chief reason for this change of capital seems to be the superiority of Trichinopoly to Madura as a defensive stronghold. Chokkanātha must have learnt its value from his experience of the past six years. He probably disregarded, or was not cognizant of, the dangers attending on his move.[20] Having decided to fix his court permanently at Trichinopoly, he set about equipping it with all the paraphernalia of a capital. Accordingly in 1666 he made projects for the construction of a palatial residence there. He laid hands on the magnificent palace of Tirumala Nāyaka in Madura and ordered the removal of some of its precious materials. His motive in this work of destruction is not clear. It may be that he was averse to fresh taxation for building purposes, since the oppression of his subjects by his Pradhāni had created much discontent, and he had to punish that officer for his excesses.[21] Whether there was any justification for his act or not, he stands condemmed by the artistic world for this barbarity.

The Mysore War.—On the authority of Wilks, Mr. Rangachari states that 'Chokkanātha seems to have been engaged in the first decade of his rule in a war with Mysore'.[22] The former says that in 1667[23] 'Chuckapa, Naick of Madura, had meditated the entire conquest of Mysore; but the events of the war reversed his expectations, and left the districts of Erroor (Erode) and Darapoor (Dhārāpuram) as fixed conquests in the possession of Deo Raj, after he had urged his success to the extent of levying large contributions on Trichinopoly and other places of importance.' This amounts to the loss of Coimbatore and Salem by Chokkanātha in 1667.

Owing to the absence of the Jesuit letters between 1667 and 1675, no decisive evidence is available for the statement. Andrē Freire's letter of 1666 refers to this year as almost barren of events with regard to Madura. If the big disaster alluded to by Wilks happened in the following year, there would have been some reference in the letter to the potentialities of the situation at least.

It is hard to believe that, soon after a trying period of his reign lasting about six years, Chokkanātha contemplated the ambitious scheme of conquering the whole of Mysore. His inscriptions of 1667 (Plavanga) and 1668 (Kīlaka) are found at Kumāralingam and Tiruchengōḍu.[24] The inscriptions of Dēvarāja Uḍaiyār, of about

20 *Ante*, pp. 83-84.

21 Bertrand, iii, p. 202. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 4.

22 *I.A.*, 1917, p. 44.

23 i, p. 36.

24 Appendix D, Nos. 168 and 167.

1670, are found at and near Satyamangalam.[25] This may perhaps imply aggression on the part of the king of Mysore who probably took advantage of Chokkanātha's difficulties. But there seems to be no evidence to confirm the presence of the Mysore army in 1667 at 'Trichinopoly and other places of importance'. Obviously Wilks has antedated the events he describes. Even the Jesuit letter of 1676[26] speaks only of Mysore's fortifying the citadels taken from the northern provinces of Madura; there is no reference at all in it to the possession of Coimbatore and Salem by Mysore. The conquests referred to above were most probably those of Chikkadēva in the last years of Dēvarāja's reign. Moreover, the statement of Wilks, quoted above, need not be taken seriously, as his facts and dates with regard to Madura are not always above question. In 1653 he speaks of a 'Vencatadry Naick, brother of the Raja of Madura', and of 'Veerapa, Naick of Madura'.[27] As he does not specify the sources, his information cannot be accepted unless it is oonfirmed by other evidence.

The reign of Chokkanātha from 1667 to nearly 1672 is practically without history. If any Jesuit letters were written during this time, they are all lost; at any rate, André Freire's letter of 1673, which is said to contain an account of Chokkanātha's wars, has suffered this fate.[28]

[25] *Ibid.*, Nos. 171, 172, and 174.

[26] Bertrand, iii, p. 249. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 5.

[27] i, p. 34.

Mr. Rangachari's treatment of Wilks in this respect is very confused. Even though he tries to reconcile his opinion with that of Wheeler, he does not say how far he agrees with him. He seems to accept his date, i.e., 1667, for Chokkanātha's alleged war with Mysore, but certain other statements of his go against this seeming approval. His reference to the Tanjore, Mysore, and Ramnad campaigns seems to indicate that, in his opinion, the second preceded the third. He speaks of the 'next ten years' of Chokkanātha's reign as a period of 'profound tranquility', but does not specify the period (*I.A.*, 1917, p. 44). Later on, he observes that, 'in 1674 the interval of peace ended and Chokkanātha entered into a series of wars' (*Ibid.*, p. 57). Accordingly, the interval of peace refers to the period, 1664-74, and therefore the Mysore war must have taken place in 1664 or before. This means the rejection of Wilks's date, viz., 1667. Further, Mr. Rangachari does not say whether he agrees with his facts. He seems to believe that a Mysore invasion took place in the early years of Chokkanātha's reign. He does not attempt to prove it, but rest content with the reference to an inscription of 1669-70. In antother connection he refers to the conquests of Doḍḍadēva in 1667 in the kingdom of Madura (*I.A.*, 1917, p. 122).

[28] Bertrand, iii, p. 247 and *n*. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 5.

War with Tanjore, 1673.—Nelson ascribes this war to 1674, though André Freire's letter of 1676 says that an account of it had been given in his letter of 1673. We have to depend almost entirely on native chronicles for an account of Chokkanātha's war with Tanjore.[29] Though there are discrepancies with regard to details, they agree in the main events.

The precise cause of this war is not clear. According to the chronicles, it was the refusal of Vijayarāghava to give his daughter in marriage to Chokkanātha. It is likely that the loss of the latter's conquest in Tanjore, referred to by John Nieuhoff,[30] was the governing consideration. Probably Chokkanātha only demanded the Tanjore princess as a subterfuge for his intended war. Nelson[31] says: 'One would naturally have supposed that the offer of marriage would have been gladly accepted, more especially as the two kings . . . were both Nāyakkans, descended probably from common ancestors'. This was far from being the case; Śevvappa Nāyaka, the ancestor of the Tanjore Nāyaks, was connected by marriage with the Vijayanagar royal house,[32] whereas the ancester of the Nāyaks of Madura could not boast of such nobility, and was only a humble servant of the emperor, who gradually rose to a high position. Though this difference in status was overlooked by some of his predecessors, Vijayarāghava may have thought differently of the matter. There is no evidence to confirm the statement of the chronicles that Tirumala Nāyaka stabbed one of his wives, a Tanjore princess, for speaking disparagingly of his new palace at Madura and preferring her father's palace at Tanjore. Most probably Vijayarāghava attributed all his past sufferings to the ambitions of Chokkanātha. There can have been no real good-will between the two.

It is said that Chokkanātha's agents, who carried the proposal for marriage, were contemptuously treated.[33] Highly enraged at this insult, Chokkanātha collected a large army, and entrusted the Tanjore expedition to his Daḷavāy, Venkaṭakrishṇappa Nāyaka,

29 Taylor, *O.H.MSS.*, ii. pp. 185 and 191-9; *C.R.*, iii. p. 177; S.K.A., *Sources.* p. 324 *et seq.*

30 *Ante*, p. 119.

31 p. 191.

32 *Ante*, p. 37.

33 The relations between Madura and Tanjore had been strained from the very beginning, and this strain was aggravated as the two viceroyalties gradually hardened in their particular attitude towards the empire. The difference of status, due to the closer connection of Tanjore with the fuling family of Vijayanagar, could not

and his Pēshkār (Revenue Officer or Treasurer), Chinna Tambi Mudaliyār.[34] Chinna Kaṭṭira Nāyaka of Kaṇṇivāḍi accompanied them with his troops. They marched to Tanjore, and first captured Vallam, after defeating a detachment of the Tanjore army. Vijayarāghava, informed of this defeat, soon collected a large force to meet the Madura army, which was rapidly proceeding to attack his capital. A well-contested battle took place, and victory declared in favour of Madura. The Daḷavāy, Venkaṭakrishṇappa, sent a message to Vijayarāghava urging him to accept the marriage alliance and avert disaster. The Tanjore Nāyak adhered to his first reply and rejected the offer of peace. Then a regular siege of Tanjore began; the fort was stormed and the Madura army entered the town. A second message of good-will was sent, but Vijayarāghava did not yield, and was bent on fighting to the last, in spite of numerous desertions from his side. Making arrangements for the blowing up of the *harem* at his signal, he reconciled himself to his son, who was in prison, and came out boldly with him to fight the enemy. He scornfully rejected the last conciliatory message of the Madura general, and despatched the order for the destruction of the whole royal household. After some mutual slaughter, the

have been a bar to the proposal of marriage alliance, as Raghunatha is said to have married a Pāṇdya princess and a daughter of the Nāyak of Gingi. There is also nothing improbable in Tirumala having married the Tanjore princess, whether she was actually stabbed to death, in the manner described, or not. In view, therefore, of these previous alliances it is extremely likely that Chokkanātha sought an alliance by marriage with Tanjore. The request for the alliance and the refusal to comply must both be considered solely from the point of view of political relationship between the two families. It is very likely that Chokkanātha sought an alliance, among other reasons, to gain the support of Tanjore against his own troublesome feudatories and officers. Vijayarāghava's reluctance may have been based similarly on the past failure of such alliance to bring about friendship between the families or a common policy between both. It is not unlikely that there was some kind of ill-treatment of a Tanjore princess, and Vijayarāghava was reluctant on that ground to send another princess into the family of Madura. However that may be, the fact that a proposal was made for the hand of a princess and the proposal was rejected was not the sole cause of the war between the two. The habitual opposition of policy and the traditional hostility of years would be quite enough to justify the view of Tanjore that there was nothing to be gained by a marriage alliance. The provoking cause at the time must have been something in the internal troubles of Chokkanātha and his doubt as to the attitude of Tanjore with regard to the aggressions of Mysore. If Madura suspected the neutrality of Tanjore, the rejection of the mariage proposals would have been sufficient cause to go to war. The proposal of marriage must therefore have been made—as the change of capital must have been—to prevent any understanding between advancing Mysore and Tanjore on the flank.—*Ed.*

[34] He is also described as the Daḷavāy and Pradhāni for seven years. Taylor, *O.H.MSS.*, ii, p. 120, Tamil passage.

mines were set fire to and all perished. Vijayarāghava died along with his son in the struggle that ensued. The Madura Daḷavāy garrisoned Tanjore and returned to Trichinopoly. The whole kingdom of Vijayarāghava fell into the hands of Chokknātha, who appointed his foster-brother, Aḷagiri Nāyaka, as its viceroy. All the three commanders were honoured with gifts and titles.[35]

The Mahratta Conquest and Occupation of Tanjore.—In 1674 Aḷagiri Nāyaka became the ruler of Tanjore. He restored peace and order, organized the affairs of the kingdom, and sent the surplus revenue to Chokkanātha. In this subordinate position he did not remain long. His ambition increasing with power, he neglected the regular remission of the revenues to Trichnopoly, and failed to despatch the necessary correspondence. Sometimes he addressed letters to Chokkanatha in the style of an independent king of Tanjore. The latter was irritated by his conduct and sent a note of admonition to him. Aḷagiri merely justified his letter by referring to his status and the custom of the Tanjore court. Chokkanātha was beside himself with rage, but was advised by his ministers to refrain from undertaking a punitive expedition and watch further developments. Alagiri Nāyaka thus lost the support of Chokkanātha at a time when his hold over Tanjore was not well established.

Aḷagiri seems to have retained in his service some at least of the officers of the late king. At any rate, Venkaṇṇa, the latter's Rāyasam (Secretary), continued in power.[36] He seems to have observed the attitude of Alagiri towards Chokkanātha and the possibilities of a rupture between the two. He may have been discontented with his position and influence in the new regime. He was told that the Nāyak family of Tanjore was not totally extinct,

[35] Mr. Rangachari's account of this war (*I.A.*, 1917, pp. 58-62) best illustrates his conception and treatment of history, and gives point to the well-known statement of Polybius that 'to admit the possibility of a miracle is to annihilate the possibility of history.' He characterises the Tanjore war as romance and gives it a treatment accordingly. He describes not only the battle between the two armies, but also 'the war of magic' with numerous parallel references, perhaps to prove its reality. He does not give an account of the war collated from the various chronicles, but heaps version upon version. Sometimes he breaks the progress of his narrative by drawing pointed attention to amazing improbabilities, inconsistencies, and anachronisms. Though he says that the accounts given by Wheeler and Manucci are 'inaccurate', 'positively wrong', etc., he gives them fully, but thinks it 'unnecessary to enter into a criticism of these fables'. Finally he enters into a philosophical lament on, what may be termed, 'the blind and inexorable law of conseqences' and completes his history of the war with a reference to ghostly manifestations.

[36] S.K.A., *Sources*, p. 327.

and that a boy had been saved from the catastrophe which had recently befallen the royal household and was being secretly brought up at Negapatam by a wealthy merchant.[37] This information was skilfully utilised by Venkaṇṇa, who worked out a scheme to bring about the downfall of Aḷagiri, and the restoration of the old dynasty with the object of bettering his fortunes. It is highly probable that he directed all the influence he had in the kingdom to creating a complete breach between Aḷagiri and Chokkanātha. Organizing the necessary measures to facilitate his *coup d'état*, he hastened to Negapatam to get hold of the boy, Chengamala Dās.[38] It is said that Vekaṇṇa lived with the boy in the merchant's house till he was ten or twelve years of age, i.e. for about eight year. But it is clear from the Jesuit letter of 1676[39] that Aḷagiri's power in Tanjore must have come to an end about 1675. Moreover, Venkaṇṇa was too much of a politician not to realize that a moment's delay would be dangerous to the success of his plans. Taking the boy and his nurse with him, he went to Bijapur to obtain help from the Sultan for the establishment of Chengamala Dās on the throne of Tanjore. His diplomacy was successful, and Ekoji (Venkaji), the general of 'Idal Khan', was ordered to drive Aḷagiri out of Tanjore and re-instate the boy on the throne.[40]

Aḷagiri Nāyaka was alive to the danger which threatened him, and he made careful preparations to meet Ekoji. The latter's progress was arrested, and he had to employ other means to secure his object. He stayed for about a year on the borders of the kingdom, awaiting a more favourable opportunity. Meanwhile Venkaṇṇa's adherents seem to have executed their part of the scheme faithfully and with success; Aḷagiri had estranged Chokkanātha, and the people of Tanjore were ready for a bold stroke of policy. Accordingly, Ekoji marched to Tanjore and laid siege to it. Alagiri realized his distressing position and humbly appealed to Chokkanātha for help;

[37] *Ibid.*, pp. 325-6. He is described as a petty merchant in another chronicle. Taylor, *O.H. MSS.*, ii, p. 200.

[38] He is said to have been the son of Vijayarāghava some chronicles, and in others, the son of Mannār Dās, the son of Vijayarāghava. As Vijayarāghava is described as a man of eighty at the time of his death, it is more probably that he was the son of Mannār Dās and grandson of Vijayarāghava. There is a difference of opinion about his age also, whether he was two or four years old when he was taken to Negapatam.

[39] Bertrand, iii, pp. 247-8. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 5.

[40] Nelson (p. 194) gives a slightly different account, but does not state his authority. He says that Chengamala Dās 'escaped from the Palace during the confusion which ensued upon its destruction, and fled for refuge to the court of Idal Khan, who received him kindly and promised to assist him.

but the latter remained obdurate and would not forgive his past conduct. Ekoji captured the fort on the first attack, and Aḷagiri is said to have fled to Mysore.[41] The whole kingdom of Tanjore was now in the hands of Ekoji.

In accordance with the instructions of his master, Ekoji crowned Chengamala Dās and entrusted Venkaṇṇa with the conduct of the ceremonials. It is said that the foster-mother of the king showed the place where the treasures of Vijayarāghava had been buried, and that a sum amounting to twenty-six lakhs in *pagoḍas* and jewels was found. Munificent gifts were made to Ekoji and others who had espoused his cause, besides the revenues of the districts of Kumbakonam, Mannārkōvil, and Pāpanāśam, to cover the expenses of Ekoji's expedition.[42] After this, Ekoji is said to have retired with his army to Kumbakonam.

Nelson[43] remarks that, after the conquest of Tanjore, Ekoji threatened Trichnopoly, but was not bold enough to hazard his recent success by attacking it. This is supported by a Jesuit letter. But he goes further and says that 'in a very short time Ekoji had made himself master of the greater part of the kingdom (of Madurai), and of all its principal places, with the exception perhaps of Śattiyamangalum. . . . Nothing was left to Chokka Nātha but the fortress of Trichnopoly.' It seems Nelson has misunderstood André Freire's letter of 1676, which only says that 'the citadel and the kingdom were about to be his conquest if his boldness had equalled his good fortune'. Continuing, it observes: 'Day by day Ekoji, on the one hand, and the king of mysore, on the other *will* absorb the last *débris* of this kingdom, once so flourishing. The conquest of it *will* be very easy'.[44]

[41] *Tanjāvūri Āndhra Rājula Charitra* and *Tanjāvūri Vāri Charitra* say that Ekoji marched straight off into the kindom of Tanjore, captured the fort of Aiyampet, and completely routed Aḷagiri in a pitched battle. The latter hurriedly withdrew to Tanjore. Receiving no help from Chokkanātha, suspecting treachery from his own men, and finding Ekoji attack the fort of Tanjore, he lost courage and fled with his family and faithful followers by night to Mysore, by way of Ariyalūr. But this account is not supported by the Jesuit letter. Bertrand, iii, pp. 247-8. *Vide* Appendix A Letter No. 5.

[42] Another chronicle says that the revenue from the Kumbakonam district was given to Ekoji for the maintenance of his army. Taylor, *O.H. MSS.*, ii, p. 201.

[43] p. 196.

[44] Bertrand, iii ,p. 248. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 5.

Further, Nelson says that 'Ekoji omitted to carry out Idal Khan's orders with regard to the reinstatement of Chengamala Nāyakkan'. [45] This opinion is partly the result of his unbounded faith in the Jesuit letters, and of his rejection of all other testimony, however valuable. The following seems to be his authority: 'This is what has just happened at Tanjore. General Ekoji, instead of placing the son of the late Nāyak on the throne, according to the orders of Idal Khan, has preferred to usurp the title and authority of an independent king.'[46] This statement in the Jesuit letter does not follow close upon the description of Ekoji's conquest of Tanjore. Hence it is open to the inference that his usurpation took place some time after his conquest. Moreover, all the chronicles agree in saying that Chengamala Dās was made king of Tanjore and that Ekoji's usurpation happened later.

The rule of Chengamala Dās did not begin under a happy augury. His first act ultimately led to his ruin. Persuaded by his nurse, he appointed the merchant of Negapatam, who had protected him in his exile, as his Dalavāy and Pradhāni. Rāyasam Venkaṇṇa had worked so zealously for the cause of Chengmala Dās, hoping to occupy this high office. He was highly displeased at the loss of his coveted prize, and he plotted the ruin of his master. He left Tanjore and went to the camp of Ekoji at Kumbakonam to induce him to take possession of the kingdom. Though he worked on his ambition skilfully, the latter's fear of his master, the Bijapur Sultan, made him turn a deaf ear to his importunity. Soon the news of the death of 'Idal Khan' was received, and Ekoji was emboldened. Venkaṇṇa promised him hearty co-operation, and assured him that the kingdom would be his, without a struggle. He hurried to Tanjore and terrified Chengamala Dās by an exaggerated account of Ekoji's plans against him, with the result that the young king and his followers left Tanjore and took refuge in Ariyalūr. Ekoji captured Tanjore without any effort. Venkaṇṇa was given a free hand, and he restored peace and order in the kingdom in a short time. But Ekoji had no faith in the constancy of Venkaṇṇa's loyalty, as he had betrayed two of his former masters, Aḷagiri and Chengamala Dās. Consequently, he thought of imprisoning him. Venkaṇṇa, the unscrupulous king-maker, managed to learn his impending fate, and, cursing his stars, left Tanjore stealthily. This is the account given in the chronicles.[47]

[45] p. 196.

[46] Bertrand, iii, p. 249. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 5.

[47] S.K.A. *Sources*, pp. 326-7; Taylor *C.R.*, iii, pp. 178-9; *O.H. MSS.*, ii, pp 201-2.

The Jesuit records refer only to the fact of Ekoji's usurpation, and do not detail the circumstances leading to it. The letter of 1676[48] describes the methods of his settlement of the country. Ekoji tried to make amends for the defect in his title by increasing the material welfare of his subjects. He paid particular attention to agriculture, and improved irrigation facilities by repairing and constructing canals and tanks. Lands lying fallow were cultivated, and the harvest of 1675-6 was unusually rich, excelling the records of many preceding years.[49]

Chokkanātha and Mysore.—Chokkanātha's authority in Coimbatore and Salem till at least 1669 is probably confirmed by his inscriptions, dated 1663, at Tiruchchengōḍu,[50] 1665 at Kaṇṇaḍiputtūr,[51] 1667 at Kumāralingam, and 1668-9 at Tiruchchengāḍu.[52] He recognizes Śrīranga Rāya (III) as emperor in three of these, and also in his Śrīrangam inscription of 1662.[53] From about 1670 the epigraphical records of the Mysore rulers are found in this part of the Madura kingdom. Dēvarāja Uḍaiyār's inscriptions are those at Śengalarai in 1669-70, and at Viṇṇappalli in 1671.[54] Chikkadēva Rāya's records are found in 1673 at Doḍḍa Bēlūr, and in 1676 at Kumārapāḷaiyam and Satyamangalam.[55] It is therefore clear that, during the last years of Dēvarāja Uḍaiyār (1659-72), there were encroachments on Madura territory, and that Chikkadēva was pursuing the aggressive policy of his predecessor.

[48] Bertrand, iii, p. 249. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 5,

[49] Mr. Rangachari speaks of Ekoji's march to Trichinopoly and the failure of his attempt to capture it, owing to the 'vigilance', of Chokkanātha, after his usurpation and pacification of Tanjore. (*I.A.*, 1917, p.76.) He gives a reference to Nelson. Moreover, he says that, for all the information contained in the Jesuit letters, his authority is Nelson. But the latter puts this event 'a few days' after the conquest of Tanjore by Ekoji. Further he attributes his failure not to the 'vigilance' of Chokkanātha, but to Ekoji's want of boldness and unwillingness to take risk and thereby compromise his recent success. Ekoji's usurpation, or disregard of the instructions of his master, came after his appearance before Trichnopoly. Nelson (p. 196) gives the Jesuit version correctly. Mr. Rangachari, however, rightly differs from him in speaking of the crowning of Chengamala Dās, and in placing Ekoji's usurpation after this event.

[50] Appendix D, No. 158.

[51] *Ibid.*, Nos. 165 and 166.

[52] *Ibid.*, Nos. 168 and 167.

[53] *Ibid.*, No. 157.

[54] *Ibid.*, Nos. 172 and 174,

[55] *Ibid.*, Nos. 176, 181. and 182.

The actual events leading to this expansion of Mysore at the expense of Madura are clouded in obscurity. Chokkanātha was too busy with perils nearer home till about 1666. His internal affairs seem to have engaged his attention for some time more. It is highly probable that Dēvarāja Uḍaiyār took advantage of the general weakness of Madura during this period. With the accession of Chikkadeva Rāya (1672-1704) events seem to have marched more rapidly. About this time probably, Chokkanātha of Madura, the general of the Tanjore ruler, one Dāmarla Aiyapēndra, and an officer of the Bijapur Sultan are said to have fought at Erode against Chikkadēva of Mysore to uphold the claims of Śrīranga III. They were defeated, and the Vijayanagar emperor fled to Ikkēri.[56]

Śivappa Nāyaka, after murdering his elder brother, had become ruler of Bednore. He approached Chikkadēva with the proposal for an alliance between them. On the latter's refusal, he took up the cause of Śrīranga, the refugee emperor, and, with the help of some neighbouring chiefs, declared war on Mysore.[57] He was defeated at Hassan and Śakkarēpaṭṇa, and these places were annexed to Mysore.

The above-mentioned defeat of Chokkanātha and his allies at Erode is referred to in an inscription of 1679,[58] which says that Chikkadēva conquered the 'Pāṇḍya King Chokka' in battle. Another inscription of Chikkadēva,[59] dated 1686, rccords that he 'defeated the army of the Lord of Madhura in the Īrōḍu country, took Tṛpura (Tṛśirapura, i. e. Trichinopoly) and Anantapuri, slew Dāmarla Aiyapēndra, put Anantoji to flight, and took by assault Śāmbaḷḷi, Ōmalūr and Dhārāpuram'. It is perhaps these events that Wilks ascribes to 1667.[60]

It is likely that disagreements arose between Chokkanātha and the ruler of Tanjore as a result of this defeat, which probably precipitated the former's war against the latter about 1673. Hence

[56] S.K. A., *Sources*, p. 21.

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 309.

[58] Appendix D, No. 186.

[59] *Ibid.*, No. 194.

[60] *Ante* p. 161. The series of events that ultimately led to the results embodied in this incription are detailed in the Introduction. Early in the reign of Sriranga, Mysore gave clear indications of her feeling of independence and thus became the object of attack by the emperor and, in his name, by the Nāyak of Madura and others for their own purpose. Two or three wars can be discerned in this effort, and this last under Chikkadēva Rāya was the culmination of the successful effort of Mysore to hold her own against this adverse combination.—*Ed.*

the remark in a Jesuit letter of 1676 is significant, that the Nāyak of Madura was engaged in disastrous wars about 1673.[61]

The aggressions of Mysore about 1670, referred to above, may have led to Chokkanātha's war with Chikkadēva on behalf of Śrīranga III. The latter's cause was taken up again by the chief of Ikkēri without success. After this nothing is known of Śrīranga. His nephew, Kōdaṇḍarāma, the last representative of the Vijayanagar emperors known to us, is said to have defeated Daḷavāy Kumāraiya, the Mysore general, at Āsana (Hassan).[62]

Nothing definite is known about the fate of Śrīranga III and Kōdaṇḍarāma. A silver plate grant of Sivaji records his gift to the widow and two sons of the former, who is said to have died a fugitive, 'in the west country'.[63] This means that Śrīranga III must have died some time before 1677.

By 1676 Chikkadēva Rāya had occupied the province of Satyamangalam, and captured the important fortresses in the north-west of the kingdom of Madura. He strengthened them with a view to further encroachments on Madura territory, on the plea of safeguarding himself against the Muhammadans. Probably he thought that Chokkanātha's intended war against Ekoji would afford him a favourable opportunity for the carrying out of his schemes against Madura. About 1676 the political horizon was very dark; preparations for war were being made by Madura, Mysore, and Tanjore, and a Bijapur invasion to punish Ekoji for his usurpation was expected.[64]

Sivaji's Expedition into the Carnatic (1676-7).—The most important event of 1677, which largely influenced the politics of South India, was the invasion of Sivaji.[65] Though it startled many by its suddenness, it was in course of preparation for some time. Its chief objective seems to have been to bring Tanjore under his authority, and the other kingdoms of the south, if possible. Raghunāthpant (Raghunāth Nārayen Hanmante) was an able and confidential

[61] Bertrand, iii, p. 247. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 5.

[62] S.K.A., *Sources*, pp. 22 and 312.

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 322, *n.*

[64] Bertrand, iii, p. 249. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 5

[65] A detailed account is given in the *Life of Shivaji*, by N.S. Takakhav and K. A. Keluskar (pp. 421-65); *Shivaji and His Times*, by Jadunath Sarkar (pp.363-99); the *History of the Maratha People*, by C.A. Kincaid and D.B. Parasnis (i, pp. 249-60); and Grant Duff's *History of the Mahrattas* (i, pp. 219-30).

minister of Shahji, and, in course of time, he became the administrator of Ekoji's heritage. The latter's frequent interference in his work reduced his power and influence. Raghunāthpant wrote to Sivaji about his brother's maladministration. Thereupon Ekoji received a letter of advice from Sivaji, but he did not pay any heed to it. Raghunāthpant grew disgusted with Ekoji, and worked out plans to secure his kingdom for Sivaji. He is said to have come to a friendly understanding with some of the chiefs of the Carnatic, principally the Bijapur gonernór of Gingi, before leaving for Satara to interview Sivaji and discuss with him the question of a southern expedition. On his way he concluded an alliance with the Sultan of Golkonda through the good offices of his Hindu ministers, Akanna and Madanna. He revealed the details of his plans to Sivaji, and convinced him of the ease with which they could be executed. Sivaji fell in with his views and concluded a treaty with the Moghul emperor by lavishly bribing his general and paying him a large amount of tribute. About the close of 1676, Sivaji commenced his march of the south with an army, it is said, of 40,000 foot and 30,000 horse. He stayed at Bhagnagar (Hyderabad, Dakhan) for about a month, to complete his preparations with the help of the Sultan of Golkonda to whom he is said to have promised one-half of his conquests. This is confirmed by a letter of Bombay (English East India Company Agent's) to Surat, dated 27th June, 1677, which contains the following information : 'Mr. Child (the Chief Factor at Karwar) writes that Sivaji is in a castle of the King of Golconda where he intends to winter; and after the rains, it is thought, intends against the Canatic. Several of the Deccan Omrahs are joined with him, and it is believed that Bullal Cawn and he have agreed to share all between them.' Another letter, dated 11th July, 1677, says that 'Sivaji is at present a great way off in the Carnatic country, where he wintered'. A third letter of the 24th of August records that 'Sivaji is at present in the Upper Carnatic, where he has taken the strong castle of Chingy (Gingi), Chingavore, Pilcundah and several others; and shamefully routed the Moors (the army of Bijapur), and, it is believed, he robbed Seringapatam and carried away great riches from thence; and they say, he designs, on his return back, to take Bridroor (Bednore) and so join Canara to his conquests.' Madras, in a letter dated 1st September, 1677, 'informs the Company that the nearness of Sivaji engages all their attention to fortify'—it describes his force and success—and says that three messengers were sent by him with letters.[66]

Equipping himself strongly, and carefully securing the safety of his communications to the north, Sivaji hastened to Gingi and

[66] Orme, *Historical Fragments*, p. 233.

captured it without any great difficulty. This easy success was chiefly due to the tact and foresight of his able lieutenant, Raghunāthpant, who had exploited the venality and faithlessness of the Bijapur officers. In July, 1677, Sivaji was in possession of Gingi,[67] and had organized his own system of military administration there. Shortly after, his brother, Santaji, who had been with Ekoji till then, came over to him. After sending most of his army to the siege of Vellore, Sivaji marched towards Tanjore in July,[68] and halted at Tiruvāḍi, on the Coleroon, to interview his brother Ekoji.

The events that transpired at this interview have come to us in two distinct versions. The *Life of Shivaji* referred to above, chiefly based on Mahratta *bakhars*, contains a full and detailed account,[69] which gives a picture of Sivaji's motives and actions, at any rate not uncomplimentary to him, whereas the Jesuit version[70] is brief and fragmentary, and blackens the name of Sivaji. According to the former authority, Sivaji invited Ekoji to send three representatives to his camp to settle their differences amicably. He received them and skilfully impressed upon them the modest nature of his demand, viz., half of his father's *jaghirs*. He told them that he had not troubled Ekoji for about thirteen years, with regard to his share of Shahji's inheritance, but had left him to enjoy it. They returned to Tanjore, and Ekoji is said to have been persuaded by some of his Muhammadan advisers, that it was derogatory to him to submit meekly to his brother's impositions. Moreover, the Nāyak of Madura and the Rāja of Mysore are said to have encouraged Ekoji by promising the help of their arms in case of necessity.[71] But

[67] Orme, *Historical Fragments*, p. 64.

[68] Wilks i, p. 52; J. Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times*, p. 391.

[69] Takakhav and Keluskar, *Life of Shivaji*, pp. 440-5.

[70] Bertrand, iii, pp. 269-70. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 6.

[71] The transactions of Sivaji in the Carnatic and his dealings with his half-brother Venkaji (or Ekoji) seem capable of an interpretation, once it is realized that Shivaji may have cherished the ambition to stand before his great enemy, the Moghul, as the acknowledged representative of the empire of Vijayanagar recently become extinct. The existence of the grant of Sivaji to the two sons of Śrīranga, though the document is not quite above suspicion, and the issue of coinage, of which one specimen, at any rate, on the model of Vijayanagar, has been recently discovered are indications in support of what some of the Mahratta documents do record in respect of this particular idea of Sivaji. Shahji had acquired, as his *jaghir* in the Carnatic. territory, which could favourably compare with that of any South Indian viceroy under Hindu rule. After the acquisition of Tanjore Venkaji was actually in occupation of the territory of the Nāyaks of Tanjore and of Gingi with a considerable portion of Mysore in addition. Madura was already decrepit and must have seemed to Sivaji capable of being brought under his imperial protection. Ikkēri was probably

the diplomacy of Raghunāthpant soon induced the former to withdraw from his alliance with Ekoji and pay a countribution of six lakhs of *hun* to Sivaji.[72] Realizing the weakness of his position, Ekoji paid a visit to Sivaji and was honourably received by him. Ekoji remained in Sivaji's camp for nearly twenty days, and all the latter's persuasions did not draw any decided reply from him. In the end, Ekoji fearing violence, hurried back to Tanjore stealthily. Though Sivaji was indignant at the slur thus cast on his honour and reputation, he restrained himself. Again he tried negotiations by moderating his demand. But Ekoji was prepared to part with one-half of Shahiji's movables only. Sivaji was much pained at his obstinacy, but did not think it consistent with his status and name to make war with his brother; So he marched to Vellore, and contended himself with the subjugation of the surrounding country. The refractory Polegars were reduced, and the defences of the conquerd country improved.[73] Sivaji advanced to Śeringapatam and exacted tribute. Soon news came from the north that the Moghul emperor, Aurangzib, alarmed at his progress in the south, was at last prepared to lead a campaign against him in person. Sivaji confirmed Santaji in the governorship of Gingi, and left a contingent of his troops in reserve under Raghunāthpant and Hamīr Rao, the commander-in-chief (probably Orme's Hargee Raja,) for his help. With the rest of his army he hastened to the north about the beginning of November, 1677.

André Freire's letter of 1678 says that Sivaji, under the cover of brotherly love, drew Ekoji to an interview, and treacherously seized and imprisoned him, to make him disgorge all his ill-gotten treasures. When the latter contrived to escape somehow, the former annexed all his territories north of the Coleroon. After giving Santaji charge of all his conquests, and making a Brahman (probably Raghunāthpant is referred to) his counsellor, he fled to the north to check the Moghul advance against him. This is a partial and distorted account of the transactions of Sivaji with Ekoji; the former is respresented as a greedy monster, who did not scruple to use force and employ treachery to secure his selfish ends.

inclined to support him against Mysore. Mysore was perhaps the one state that was likely to prove troublesome. If Sivaji cherished such an idea, it cannot have been regarded impracticable in 1677, and all his efforts to bring his brother to reason need not necessarily have been the result of greed. All the details of the transaction taken together seem to indicate a clearly higher motive, and that may well have been the ambition to stand before Aurangzib as the acknowledged successor of the emperors of Vijayanagar.—*Ed.*

72 J. Sarkar; *Shivaji and His Times*, pp. 389-90.

73 Bertrand, iii, p. 271. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 6.

Ekoji's War with Santaji :—The withdrawal of Sivaji from the south gave Ekoji an opportunity to declare war on Santaji, who had fled from his protection and who was now in charge of the kingdom of Gingi. Ekoji must have understood that the author of all his troubles, in connection with his brother Sivaji, was Raghunāthpant, formerly his servant but now the chief advisor of Santaji. He thought of regaining his reputation, which had been damaged by his transactions with Sivaji. Therefore he crossed the Coleroon about the 25th of Ncvember, 1667, and conducted an aggress campaign against Santaji.[74]

The latter organized his resources and marched to the south to meet Ekoji. A long and severe battle ensueed. The Tanjore army fought with obstinacy and courage, and cut the enemy's army to pieces. The vanquished, however, without losing their presenee of mind, skillfully entrapped the enemy into an ambuscade. The scene of the struggle is said to have been Vālikonḍapuram. Ekoji reteated with a part of his army, in great confusion, and reached Tanjore. His initial success blinded him to the ordinary precautions of warfare, and his ambitious schemes suffered a sudden collapse.

The progress of Sivaji's march to his home-country was arrested by the news of Ekoji's unexpected movements against his lieutenant at Gingi. He stopped at Torgal, and began correspondence with Raghunāthpant. When he learnt that Ekoji's plans had been frustrated, he was far from being vindictive. He despatched the terms of a treaty, consisting of nineteen clauses, for the approval of Ekoji.[75] The treaty made provision for the administration of Tanjore on improved lines. It reveals everywhere Sivaji's spirit of humanity and his administrative experience. It was a blow aimed at the feudal obligations of Shahji and his heirs to the Sultans of Bijapur. Ekoji ratified the agreement and reverted to his humble role as ruler of Tanjore. It is said that Ekoji had to pay a large sum of money to get back his kingdom, viz., three lakhs of *hun* in cash.[76]

Setting everything according to the directions of Sivaji, Santaji marched to Vellore to bring its siege to a speedy termination.[77] For

[74] J. Sarkar. *Shivaji aud His Times*, p. 397. Wilks (i, p. 53) ascribes this war to the month of December of the same year.

[75] Takakhav and Keluskar, *Life of Shivaji*, pp. 459-62.

[76] J. Sarkar *Shivaji and His Times*, p. 398; Bertrand, iii, p. 272. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 6.

[77] The statement in a Jesuit letter (Bertrand, iii, p. 271, *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 6) that he joined his brother, Sivaji, who was engaged in the siege of Vellore, is not correct. Sivaji had gone to the north by this time. This error is retained by Nelson (p. 200)

nearly a year the Mahratta army was engaged in the reduction of this fort. Sivaji's disappearance from the south protracted the siege. At last the fort was captured by Raghunāthpant about the middle of August, 1678, after an investment of fourteen months.[78] After the fall of Vellore, Sivaji's representative ruled his southern kingdom in peace for some years ; and, foreseeing the necessity of resisting the Great Moghul, strengthenrd its fortifications with great labour.

Though Chokkanātha had stood neutral in his foster-brother Aḷagiri's struggle with Ekoji, he ways by no means prepared to befriend the latter. He cannot have been unmindful of the possibility of his becoming a danger to him. When Ekoji was engaged in his war with Santaji, Chokkanātha led his army into Tanjore. Ekoji's hurried retreat to his capital, after this disastrous war, offered him the chance he was eagerly looking for. But he had not the nerve to deliver the decisive blow. He could have annihilated the remnants of Ekoji's demoralized army or captured the town of Tanjore, before they could enter it. He, however, preferred ease and diplomacy to prompt action, as he had come to an agreement with Santaji, by which he gave him a large sum of money in return far the promised cession of the kingnom of Tanjore. The treaty between Ekoji and and Santaji put an end to all possibility of the latter's redeeming his pledge to his ally. Thus unscrupulously duped, Chokkanātha returned in disgrace to Trichinopoly.[79]

Chokkanātha's Deposition and Restoration—The Usurpation of Rustam Khan.—The weak and vacillating foreign policy of Chokkanātha only increased the miseries of his subjects. His projected conquest of Tanjore seriously affected his purse and prestige. Mysore was not slow to exploit his folly. She captured the only two remaining fortresses of Madura on her northern frontiers. Under these circumstances, popular feeling reaching a climax, Chokkanātha was deposed, on the plea of insanity, and imprisoned ; and his younger brother, Muttulinga Nāyaka (also called Muttu Alakādri), was made king in 1678.[80] His administration did not improve the political situation. To complete the evils of maladministration and ineptitude, the whole country became subject to an inundation, consequent on the unusual fall of rains on the Western Ghats.

78 Takakhav and Keluskar, *Life of Shivaji*, pp. 439-40, *n.* 2. A Jesuit letter says that the siege of Vellore lasted for more than a year. Bertrand, iii, p. 271. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 6.

79 Bertrand, iii, pp. 270-1. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 6.

80 An inscription of his in 1678-9 records the grant of a village by him at Krishṇāpuram. Appendix D, No. 183.

Whole villages were washed away by the floods. André Freire in his letter of 1678[81] gives a heart-rending picture of the ruined greatness of Madura, similar to Caesar Frederick's description of Vijayanagar after the battle of Talikota. Popular fury was again roused. The political tension and the people's miseries were taken advantage of by Rustam Khan,[82] a Muhammadan adventurer of great ability, to usurp the throne. He was a cavalry officer of great influence. When the new king went out of the fortress of Trichinopoly, he closed its gates and assumed royal authority. To cloak his usurpation, he took Chokkanātha from prison and proclaimed him king, although he arrogated to himself and real power. It is said that he did not respect even the *harem* of the two kings. The whole country was so demoralized that his usurpation was acquiesced in for about two years. Only fresh political misfortunes precipitated his down fall. He failed to organize a strong and prudent administration, and his illegal exercise of power added to the gravity of the situation.

About 1680 the Mysoreans laid siege to Trichinopoly. Rustam Khan's inability to conduct the defence effectively led to a plot to overthrow his power. Daḷavāy Gōvindappaiya and the Sētupati, with the help of some Polegars, the chief among whom was Chinna Kaṭṭiri Nāyaka of Kaṇṇivāḍi, cleverly managed to collect a number of Chokkanātha's adherents in the fort of Trichinopoly, and murder Rustam Khan and his followers. Chokkanātha was thus freed from the tyranny of Rustam Khan.[83]

Chokkanātha's Last Years.—Chokkanātha did not enjoy the freedom which he had regained. After losing a large part of his kingdom, he was besieged in his chief stronghold of Trichinopoly by Kumāraiya, the Mysore general, whose military reputation was of a high order. In his perplexity he invited Ekoji and the Mahratta general of Gingi, Araśumalai, to come to his help. The Sētupati kept up a show of loyalty by sending his army to Trichinopoly; but Chokkanātha had faith in none of his allies, since he understood their real object to be to make his misfortunes a means of furthering their ambitions. Moreover, they saw in the aggressions of Mysore a serious menace to their safety, and would not allow her permanent possession of the territories of Madura.

[81] Bertrand, iii, p. 273. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 6.

[82] He is represented as the favourite of Chokkanātha by the *History of the Carnataca Governors* (Taylor, *O.H. MSS.*, ii, p. 35), and by a *Mackenzie Manuscript* (*Ibid.*, p. 185); but as the confidant of Muttulinga by another *Mackenzie Manuscript* (*Ibid.*, p. 203) and a Jesuit writer (Bertrand, p. 302. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 7). It is more probable that he was the favourite of Chokkanātha, as otherwise this bold venture is difficult to explain.

[83] Taylor, *O.H. MSS.*, ii, pp. 185-9, 203-4; Bertrand, iii, pp. 302-3. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 7.

Daḷavāy Kumāraiya was surprised at this unexpected and unnatural combination of forces arrayed against him. His resources were very inadequate for an open fight with them. Therefore, he commenced negotiations with Chokkanātha, and proposed an alliance between them to drive out the armies of Ekoji and Sambaji, and revive the rule of the Nāyaks of Gingi and Tanjore. He promised to respect the territorial integrity of Madura. But this offer did not evoke any response since Chokkanātha seems to have doubted the good faith of Kumāraiya. Further, he had not the capacity to adopt this forward policy. Such a reshuffling of the contending parties would not have caused a serious shock to his conscience, as he cannot have been unaware of the real worth of his allies. His indecision sealed the fate Kumāraiya's solution of his problem. Despairing of any bold move from Chokkanātha, the Mysore general speedily arranged for reinforcements from Mysore. But his despatches did not reach their destination owing to the machinations of his enemies. To gain time he made overtures to Araśumalai, the commander-in-chief of Sambaji, with the object of bribing him and securing his withdrawal to Gingi, but without successUnder these circumstances, Kumāraiya realized the serious danger he was involved in, and tried to make the best of an unpromising situation. A safe retreat to Mysore was the only course open to him. He therefore tried to divert the attention of Araśumalai and Ekoji from his movements, and ordered his cavalry to feign an advance against them and then withdraw with safety. Meanwhile he meditated a retreat to Mysore with his infantry. But he could not deceive his enemies, whose attention was exclusively on his army. They suddenly attacked it and cut it to pieces. Kumāraiya himself became a captive in their hands. This defeat of Mysore crowned the triumph of Araśumalai, who vigorously pushed his success further and drove the Mysoreans from the kingdom of Madura. He captured all their possessions and laid siege to Trichinopoly itself, as he had no idea of respecting his ally Chokkanātha's feelings, and was not prepared to make good his promise of restoring the kingdom to him. This vile treachery was too much for Chokkanātha to bear. His cup of misery was now full and he did not survive the shock.[84]

Relations with the Sētupati.—We have seen the circumstances under which Chokkanātha had to conduct an expedition against Tirumalai Sētupati in the early years of his reign, and with what result. The former was baffled in his attempt to coerce the latter into the position of a loyal vassal. Till the death of Tirumalai Sētupti, matters drifted in an indecisive way. Nelson[85] says that his death took place

84 Bertrand, iii, pp. 303-6. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter, No. 7.

85 pp. 205-6

when Aḷagiri was ruling in Tanjore, i.e. about 1674. This date is probably correct, as the last inscription of Tirumalai Sētupati is the one at Hanumantaguḍi, dated 1673—4, recording a grant of lands to a Muhammadan.[86] On the death of Tirumalai Sētupati, he was succeeded by his nephew, Rāja Sūrya, who is said to have supported Chengamala Dās against Chokkanātha. The probability of this intrigue and disloyalty is strengthened by the fact that, between his predecessor and Chokkanātha there was no love lost. Daḷavāy Venkaṭakrishṇappa, who was the commander-in-chief in the war against Tanjore, captured and threw him into prison, where he is said to have been murdered. There being no legal heir to the late Sētupati, an interregnum was the result; and the Maravas had to choose a ruler. After some disagreements among them, Raghunātha Tēva, the illegitimate son of the last Sētupati, was selected. He is more familiarly known as the *Kiḻavan* (old or aged) Sētupati.

The rule of the *Kiḻavan* Sētupati in Ramnad is memorable in many ways. His first act shows his unscrupulous boldness when circumstances required stern measures. He ordered the execution of two of his strongest supporters who wielded great influence, on the ground that their excessive power might be used against him at any time. Perceiving the attitude of his vassal, one Pallava Rāyan Toṇḍamān, the chief of Pudukotta, who was intending to transfer his allegiance to the king of Tanjore, the *Kiḷavan* Sētupati dismissed him and appoined his brother-in-law (wife's brother), Raghunātha, in his place. Raghunātha thus became the founder of the modern state of Pudukotta. *Kiḷavan* Sētupati was a capable administrator who was mainly instrumental in raising the status and power of the Marava country. His share in the deliverance of Chokkanātha from the thraldom of Rustam Khan has been referred to before. As a reward for this valuable help, the title of *Para Rāja Kēsari* (Lion to Foreign Kings) was conferred on him, and the services of one Kumāra Piḷḷai were transferred to him; the latter became his Daḷavāy afterwards.

Condition of Christianity.—The death of Martinz happened on the 22nd of August, 1656; he was aged 63 and had served thirty-one years in the Madura Mission.[87] He had endeared himself so much to the Christians that his loss was deeply felt. As the Rev. J. S. Chandler remarks, 'De Nobili had planted and Martinz watered.'[88]

86 Appendix D, No. 175.

87 Bertrand, iii, p. 109.

88 *The Jesuit Mission in Madura*, p. 51.

The Muhammadan invasions in the early years of Chokkanātha's reign increased the tribulations of the missionaries though the king was, in general, well disposed towards them. Famine and pestilence which followed in the wake of the Muhammadan devastation, and the frequent raids of *Kaḷḷans* forced the Christians to flock to Trichinopoly and other places like Satyamangalam, which is said to have been 'most tranquil and happy and preserved from the devastations of war and famine'.[89] After the departure of the Muhammadans, André Freire organized the affairs of the Christians of Trichinopoly, and the latter were well looked after. All the miseries which afflicted the country were attributed to the missionaries. But Chokkanātha's attitude towards them was benevolent. Proenza remarks in his letter of 1662 that, 'graced by the justice and good administration of the young king, we could continue our work in liberty and peace'.[90] Alvarez, who was in charge of the Christians of 'Pacour', retired with his flock to 'Cangoupatti', and constructed church and presbytery there. He met with strong opposition from the Hindus who gained the king's ministers to their side, and 'lodged complaints against the missionaries so violent, and spread calumnies so atrocious that the king felt compelled to expel them'. Alvarez went to the king to take leave of him, and talked to him about the truth and precepts of Christianity and of the mode of life led by the missionaries. Chokkanātha, being much impressed, made Alvarez argue with his Brahmans. He is said to have congratulated him on his success, allowed him to remain in his church, and promised him protection.[91]

Proenza's letter of 1665 says that 'Trichinopoly has been all the time fecund in persecutions.'[92] But the favour shown to the Christians by general Ādiappa Nāyaka, a close relation of the king, who is said to have wielded great authority in his absence, gave them much relief.[93] Proenza describes in detail the charges brought against him by a 'Valaiyan' (fisherman) which led to a judicial enquiry, with the result that the former was honourably acquitted, and the latter and his partners fined some thousands of *ècus*.[94] But the hatred of the 'Valaiyan' against Proenza was only increased by the disgrace of his defeat; and he conducted intrigues in the court to render the protection of Ādiyappa Nāyaka nugatory. Proenza made the necessary

89 Bertrand, iii, p. 146.

90 *Ibid.*, p. 135.

91 Bertrand, iii, pp. 141-2.

92 *Ibid.*, p. 171.

93 *Ibid.*, pp. 175-6.

94 *Ibid*, p. 181.

arrangements to foil his opponent's plans, and left Trichinopoly for Madura to request the king to intercede in his favour. The disasters which befell the king's army in the Marava country made it difficult for him to speak to Chokkanātha in person. But the missionary succeeded in securing from him a safe-conduct, similar to the one issued by Tirumala Nāyaka. With this royal order he returned to Trichinopoly and the governor hastened to give it publicity.[95]

The change of the capital to Trichinopoly and the consequent presence there of a great number of lords and courtiers diminished the power and influence of Ādiyappa Nāyaka, the protector of the Christians. The 'Valaiyan' again intrigued with the governor and formed a plot to destroy Christianity. Proenza says: 'One day all the calumnies invented against us being narrated with warmth, the indignant prince remarked that a man guilty of such crimes deserved the lopping off of his ears. These words, pronounced vaguely and without any determined intention, were understood to be a sentence; and soon the Brahman, accompanied by the "Valaiyan" and an armed escort, came hurriedly to our church to execute the supposed royal order. Happily I left the Presbytery to take refuge in Candelour.'[96] 'The famous "Valaiyan," the most implacable of our enemies, was struck at the very moment he began new intrigues. The Nāyak, informed of his malversations, gave him a severe sentence which was promptly executed.... Balthazar Da Costa communicated with Lingama Nāyaka, the father-in-law of the king of Madura, and obtained two letters, one signed by Lingama and another by Śinnatambi Mudaliyār, the governor-general of the kingdom; they enjoined on the commandant of Trichinopoly to treat the missionaries with benevolence and favour them to the best of his ability.'[97]

André Freire's letter of 1666 refers to the conversion of a well-known Marava captain.[98] This was probably the cause of the terrible persecution of 1669, which discouraged the missionaries from going to the Marava country for about seventeen years.[99] A letter of 1676 refers to persecutions during the previous eight years in Tanjore, and the consequent shifting of the district (ecclesiastical) to Nandivanam.[100] The wars between Mysore and Madura, which

95 *Ibid.*, p. 182.

96 Bertrand, iii, pp. 182-3.

97 *Ibid.*, pp. 209-10.

98 *Ibid.*, p. 229.

99 *Ibid.*, pp. 260, 388-9.

100 *Ibid.*, p. 258.

were always waged in the latter kingdom, led to the abandonment of 'Tottiam' and 'Congoupatti' by the Christians.[101] The political condition of the country led to expansion of missionary activities to places farther north, viz., Vellore and Golkonda.[102] A letter of 1678 says that there were persecutions in Tanjore for 'the last twenty years'.[103]

That there was persecution of Christianity in the reign of Chokkanātha is abundantly clear. It is also clear that the king held to the principle of toleration in the main. The misfortunes which the country, as a whole, suffered may have stirred the feelings of the people, which probably found expression in sporadic outbursts against Christianity. But there was no organized policy or campaign of persecution. Wars and pestilence contributed more to the tribulations of the missionaries.

Chokkanātha—General Estimate.—The first few years of Chokkanātha's reign constitute a brilliant record of his greatness as a soldier and general. He was a man of energy and capacity, and he realized that a vigorous military policy was the foremost need of the hour. He could not tolerate the misdeeds of his ministers done in his name. He defeated the schemes of his enemies, who attempted to depose him, and became the real master of the kingdom by his own efforts. When he saw that his organization to repel the Muhammadan attack was a failure, he discovered the real cause of it and resolved to lead his army himself. His boldness and persistency strengthened his cause, and he succeeded in holding the Muhammadans at bay. At last his enemies had to withdraw with serious loss.

This initial success of Chokkanātha made his reputation, and filled his subjects with hope and joy. But it seems to have upset his mind and brought about the deterioration of his character. The Jesuit account of his reign give a flattering picture of his character and work during the first few years. But he was too much under the influence of his passions. His ambition made him throw all considerations of policy to the winds. When the Sētupati and the Nāyak of Tanjore failed to co-operate with him in his struggle with the Muhammadans, he flew into a rage and hastened to punish both of them, unmindful of the ultimate consequences. His undertakings were not

[101] Bertrand, iii, pp. 262 and 265.

[102] *Ibid.*, p, 268.

[103] *Ibid.*, p. 287.

in proportion to his ability and resources. He failed to conciliate his vassals, and alienated their sympathies. He had not the foresight to perceive the dangers to his kingdom which would result from the Mahratta conquest of Tanjore; he only gave himself up to the spirit of revenge in refusing help to Alagiri. He had not the courage to adopt strong measures when occasion demanded them. His belated war with Ekoji was not prosecuted with vigour. His growing weakness of mind made him the dupe of his ministers and of foreign kings. His reign is mostly a record of his follies and failures. The precocious development of his powers came to a sudden stop, and his religious enthusiasm made him an offender against duty. He developed into a copy of Vijayarāghava of Tanjore.[104]

Chokkanātha's administrative capacity seems to have been of a low order. He was greatly fascinated by the trophies of war. The chronicles say that he was 'illustrious for deeds of charity and also for those of war'.[105] His ambition lay at the root of his failure in the work of peaceful progress. His plans required large sums of money, and he seems to have tolerated the ruthless oppression of his subjects by his Pradhāni.[106] He appears to have made the sufferings of his people a source of profit to himself by fining the officer concerned. The later was let loose on his subjects, and he recouped his loss.

The reign of Chokkanātha was a period of trouble and anxiety to his people, whose miseries became more and more unendurable in course of time. It marks the beginning of the decay of the kingdom and gives a forecast of its impending fate. Chokkanātha failed to control the forces of disintegration which were tending to its extinction. Though, at the time of his death, the kingdom was totally exhausted, with its resources wasted and its enemies threatening its gates, its temporary and limited rehabilitation under his two immediate successors shows that its vitality was not all lost. Though Chokkanātha's rule was a dismal failure, it must be said, in justice to him, that the political storms were too severe not to tax his slender abilities heavily. A great statesman was required in his place. Moreover, when compared with his contempōraries, the rulers of Tanjore and Gingi, Chokkanātha was far

[104] He is described as devoting all his time to the study of the sacred books as the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Bhāgavatam*, etc. Taylor, *O.H.MSS.*, ii, p. 203.

[105] *Ibid*, p. 204.

[106] Bertrand, iii, p. 202. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 4.

above them; Madura suffered far less than these kingdoms, as the Jesuit letters abundantly testify.[107]

Chokkanātha's Death.—Chokkanātha's misfortunes were so great that he is said to have died of heart-failure. The letter of André Freire, dated 1612, refers to his death. The *Maduraittalavaralāṛu* and the *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle* ascribe it to the 5th of Āni, Dundubhi (about the 16th of June, 1682). The *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts* give the same month and year, but do not specify the day. Therefore the above—mentioned date may be taken to be correct, as it does not clash with inscriptions.

107 The difference noted may be due merely to the relative geographical position of these powers with reference to their common enemy. The more apt parallel for Chokkanātha certainly is Chikkadēva Rāya of Mysore. The advantage of the comparison is all on the side of the Mysore ruler of the day.—*Ed.*

CHAPTER XI

MUTTU VĪRAPPA NĀYAKA III

(1682-9)

Accession.—Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa, the son of Chokkanātha, succeeded his father. Whether he was the son of Chokkanātha by Mangammāḷ, and when the latter's marriage took place, are points not elucidated by Nelson and Mr. Rangachari. It is, however, said by both that Ranga Krishṇa was the son of Chokkanātha and Mangammāḷ; the former, following the Jesuit account (likely to be more correct in cases like this), says that he was fifteen years old at his accession; the latter, basing himself on Wheeler, states that he was sixteen at that time. Nelson[1] specifies the time of Mangammāḷ's marriage, whereas the other does not. On the authority of the chronicles, the former remarks that Chokkanātha, disappointed at the loss of the Tanjore princess, married Mangammāḷ when Aḷagiri was viceroy of Tanjore, i.e. about 1674. If Chokkanātha married Mangammāḷ about 1674, and even if the latter became pregnant shortly after the marriage, Ranga Krishṇa's birth could not have been earlier than about 1675. Consequently, the latter could have been only seven or eight years of age in 1682, the date of his accession. This is a vital point overlooked by Nelson. If Ranga Krishṇa was the son of Chokkanātha by Mangammāḷ,[2] the latter's marriage has to be ascribed to a date earlier than that of Nelson. A *Mackenzie Manuscript* says that Chokkanātha married Mangammāḷ, the daughter of 'Lingama Naicker, of Chandragiri-Dūpakul'.[3] A Jesuit letter of 1666[4] refers to Daḷavāy Lingama Nāyaka as the father-in-law of the king of Madura. If this Lingama was the Lingama of the chronicles, Chokkanātha's marriage with Mangammāl may have taken place in 1665. In that case, it is probable that Ranga Krishṇa was

[1] p. 198.

[2] Some doubt is cast on this by an inscription of 1687, where one Annamuttammāḷ is referred to as the mother of Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka. Appendix D, No. 196.

[3] Taylor, *O.H.MSS.*, ii, p. 199.

[4] Bertrand, iii, p. 200; *ante*, p. 187.

born about 1666-7, and he would have been fifteen years old in 1682. However, the reference to the Chandragiri-Dūpakul cannot be satisfactorily explained. There is another difficulty in this connection. Martin in his letter of 1713 says: 'Mangammāḷ could not accompany king Chokkanātha on his pyre for the same reason (pregnancy); but, after her delivery, she hit upon an expedient to escape the flames, the pretext being that there was none but herself to bring up the young prince and govern the kingdom during his minority.'[5] If this was a fact, the probability is that this infant was her second son : he may have died soon after his birth, since nothing is said about his life ; he cannot have been Ranga Krisnṇa, as is evident from other circumstances. The Jesuit account can be free from the charge of inconsistency only on this supposition. Mangammāḷ may have been the daughter of Daḷavāy Lingama Nāyaka, and probably she was raised to the dignity of queen only after the Tanjore war. This clears the position of the chronicles.

There are two inscriptions of Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa which tend to show that he was at least twentyfive years old at the time of his accession. An inscription at Tirumalasamudram and Pudukkuḷam records a grant of land in these villages by 'Śrī Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa, son of Chokkanātha.'[6] The Śaka date given in the inscription, viz., 1579, and the cyclic year, Hēviḷambi, agree. This means that Ranga Krishṇa must have been born at least by 1657. Another inscription, dated Durmukhi (1656-7) at Vaṇṇikūḍam is a sale-record for the merit of Ranga Krishṇa.[7] Sewell suspects the genuineness of the latter inscription on palaeographical grounds.

Though there is some doubt about the age of Ranga Krishṇa at his accession, the date of this event must have been 1682. The authorities quoted in connection with the date of Chokkanātha's death disagree only a little on this question; the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts* ascribe Ranga Krishṇa's accession to Āḍi, Dundubhi (July, 1682).[8]

State of the Kingdom (1682—6). The failure of Chokkanātha to keep his dominious intact reduced the extent of the kingdom of Madura.

5 Bertrand, iv, p. 206. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 12

6 Appendix D, No. 149

7 Appendix D, No. 190.

8 Mr. Rangachari attempts precision without sufficient data. He says (*I. A.*, 1927, p. 104*n*)' 'The correct date is about 1682-1689, and is proved epigraphy. by The epigraphical evidences in regard to this reign, however, are very meagre'. To substantiate the former statement, he refers to an inscription of Ranga Krishṇa in 1686, and another of 1657 (*sic*).

Consequently Ranga Krishṇa inherited only a part of his ancestral territories: the Rāja of Mysore, Sambaji, the king of Tanjore, and the Sētupati were holding portions of them.[9] He came to the throne under the most discouraging circumstances. Even the town of Madura was in the hands of his enemies; but they were quarrelling as to who was to hold it. This gloomy outlook began to improve gradually, chiefly owing to external causes. Ranga Krishṇa seems to have taken advantage of the difficulties of, and mutual disagreements among, his enemies. The troops of Sambaji ravaged the kingdom and held up the Mysoreans in the citadel of Madura for a long time.[10] Further, they desolated the provinces of Mysore. The war between Madura and Mysore had come to an end ; but the Mahrattas aimed at the annexation of the former and had therefore to drive out the latter from her possessions in Madura. The king of Mysore could not send reinforcements to his army which was shut up in Madura. However, he is said to have stealthily despatched some 10,000 *pagoḍas* through some *sanyāsis* (religious mendicants) pretending to go on a pilgrimage.[11] The Maravas helped Mysore, and therefore the siege was prolonged to more than a year. The Jesuit writer speaks of the 'atrocious wars between the king of Mysore and Sambaji'.[12] Mysore had to withdraw from her conquests in Madura owing to the merciless campaign which Sambaji waged against her in close co-operation with the chief of Bednore. Moreover, she was attacked by him in her most vital parts. Further, the wars necessiated very heavy taxation, and the Mysoreans are said to have put down this disaffection with a strong hand. The Jesuit account says : 'The king of Mysore, incensed at their (his subjects') insolence, sent an army against them to carry fire and sword everywhere, and toss the rebels on the point of the sword, without distinction of age or sex. These cruel orders were executed. The *pagoḍas* of Vishṇu and Śiva were destroyed, and their large revenues confiscated to the royal treasury. Those idolators who escaped the carnage fled to the mountains and forests, where they led a miserable life.'[14] Thus the danger to Ranga Krishṇa from Mysore was removed.

Ekoji's attention had to be directed to his own affairs. His tyranny had roused the feelings of his subjects against him. He was

[9] Bertrand, iii, p. 357. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 8.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 305.

[11] *Ibid.*, iii, pp. 360-1.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 375.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 377-8. *Vide* Appendix A Letter No. 9.

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 380-1,

despoiled of some of his possessions by the Maravas. Therefore he was reduced to impotence, as far as Madura was concerned. The Sētupati also was rendered harmless by the rebellion of his Daḷavāy. Finally, Sambaji himself was too busy occupied with his Mysore campaign to be a menace to Ranga Krishṇa.

Thus all these changes in the political situation gave Ranga Krishṇa facilities to put his kingdom in order, and extend it to its former limits. Within three or four years of his accession, he seems to have recovered possession of his lost territories. In a Jesuit letter of 1686, he is said to have 'regained the town of Madura by the expulsion of the Mysoreans', and secured the loyalty of his vassals, so much so that he was in a position to deal with them tyrannically.[15] An inscription dated Ś. S. 1608 at Arumbāvūr[16] records Ranga Krishṇa's repair of a sluice, and, therefore, confirms the fact that by 1686 he was able to devote his attention to internal administration. He seems to have been a ruler of energy and a man of strong character. His personal qualities must, to a large extent, have contributed to his success in establishing his authority all over his dominions, besides the misfortunes and engagements of his enemies.

His Dealings with the Muhammadans.—Having re-established his affairs on a sound basis, Ranga Krishṇa is said to have successfully maintained the independence and prestige of Madura. The following amusing story about his attitude towards the Moghul emperor is recorded in the chronicles.[17] It was the custom for the Padishah to send, to his vassals and independent kings, one of his slippers, mounted on an elephant with gorgeous decorations and all the paraphernalia of royalty, and with an army consisting of infantry and cavalry. When this procession reached the borders of a kingdom its king was expected, on notice, to greet the imperial mandate-bearers, render obeisance and homage, invite them to his capital, and show them due hospitality. The slipper had to be placed on his throne, and tribute and other gifts were to be given. When Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa was the king of Madura, such a mandate came to him. On the plea of ill-health he did not receive it, as was customary, before the imperial officers entered his dominions. The latter were told that the king would meet them at Śamayavaram on the bank of the Coleroon. Even when they

15 Bertrand, iii, pp. 399-400.

16 Appendix D, No. 192.

17 Taylor, *O.H.MSS.*, ii, pp. 205-8.

approached Trichinopoly, he was in no mood to welcome them, again on the pretext of serious illness. The messengers were very much annoyed, but, expecting nothing untoward, entered the citadel of the capital. Finally, they had to carry the slipper to the Throne Hall of the Palace. Ranga Krishṇa was 'high on a throne of royal state', and did not honour the emperor's representatives. Glowing with anger, the latter rushed to his presence, and offered the Moghul's slipper to him. Seriously offended, Ranga Krishṇa bade them on pain of their lives to put the slipper down. When this order was obeyed, he put one of his feet into it, and vehemently questioned the sanity of the emperor in sending him only one slipper and forgetting that he was in need of two for his use. The blood of the emperor's deputies boiled, and the king ordered their expulsion. They marched out of the fort and meditated hostile demonstrations. Ranga Krishṇa moved his army, fell on them, and cut them to pieces. The survivors escaped and narrated their experience to the emperor. The pride of the latter was humbled, and he learnt a lesson ; he gave up his custom of sending such mandates to foreign rulers.

The Moghul custom referred to above may have been prevalent, and was probably tantamount to an imperial message requiring subordination and tribute, similar to the Persian king's demand of 'earth and water' as tokens of submission. In the abstract, there is nothing improbable in such an imperial mandate. But the occurrence of an event like this in the reign of Ranga Krishṇa is extremely unlikely. The Padishah mentioned could only have been the Moghul emperor Aurangzib. Till almost the end of Ranga Krishṇa's reign, he was engaged in the reduction of the kingdoms of Bijapur and Golkonda, which was accomplished in 1686 (12th September) and 1687 (21st September) respectively.[18] After this Aurangzib had to mobilize his resources effectively against his most powerful adversary, the Mahrattas. Sambaji was captured in January, 1689, and executed on the 11th of March, 1689.[19] The Mahratta war was continued, and Raigarh fell only on the 19th of October. Aurangzib's attention was devoted exclusively to this affair till the very close of the year 1689.[20] Under these circumstances, the truth of the story narrated in the chronicles is highly problematical. Moreover, it is not likely that Aurangzib cared for formalities like those detailed above ; he looked more for the substance. Further, the statement that the Padishah was taught a severe lesson by Ranga Krishṇa's attitude is opposed to the character of Aurangzib and extremely

18 J. Sarkar, *History of Aurangzib*, iv. pp. 324, 382.

19 *Ibid.*, p. 403.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 406.

incredible. It is significant that Manucci, who takes a special interest in recording such stories, is silent on this episode.

Mr. Rangachari says that a grasp of all the circumstances of the period does not make it improbable'.[21] But he does not specify the 'circumstances'; he seems to rely mainly on Taylor's belief. The latter remarks: 'The affair of the Moghul's slipper is so singular, that we know not whether it be simple truth or rodomontade';—the 'narrative, being minute and very circumstantial, *seems likely to be nearest the truth*'.[22] Nelson [23] also is disposed to believe the story on the ground of its 'circumstantiality and consistency'. But the arguments adduced above make it difficult to accept the facts contained in it as expressing the relations of Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa with Aurangzib.[24]

The Sētupati Affairs.—Though the *Kiḷavan* Sētupati had to provide against trouble in his own territory he does not seem to have been well disposed towards his suzerain, Muttu Vīrappa III. His timely help in freeing Chokkanātha from the tyranny of Rustam Khan was greatfully recognized, as we have seen. He was gradually drifting into an independent status. It is said that about 1686 he joined Venkaṭakrishṇappa, the ex-Daḷavāy of Madura, and Chengamala Dās (the last of the Tanjore Nāyaks, who had reconciled himself with Ekoji who had driven him out of his kingdom) in organizing an attack on Madura. In return for military help from Tanjore, he was to enjoy free for twelve years the Marava districts between Pāmbār and Pudukotta. This projected campaign against Ranga Krishṇa did not materialize, as Kumāra Piḷḷai, the Ramnad Daḷavāy (whose services were transferred to the Sētupati by Chokkanātha), disapproved of his master's plans and attempted to seize him and Venkaṭakrishṇappa, to hand them over, as traitors, to Ranga Krishṇa. The Sētupati defeated the schemes of his

21 *I A.*, 1917, p. 123.

22 *O.H. MSS.*, ii, p. 218

23 p. 212.

24 There is nothing impossible in the story, as Aurangzib had had succeeded in his cherished ambition of bringing both Bijapur and Golkonda under his authority. Mysore had made a timely submission, from the point of view of Aurangzib, by sending an embassy to the great Moghul who received it kindly, if with comparativelyscant respect, and dismissed it graciously. It is said that the empire spent Rs. 2,000 upon this glorious mission 'from the Zamindar of Mysore'. It was only Madura that remained recalcitant, and this exhibition of his authority, though it may have seemed insulting in Hindu eyes, must have appeared proper to the great emperor in the full flush of his victorious career. The Mahrattas alone had to be subdued; and Aurangzib never cherished any doubt about his ultimate success.—*Ed.*

Daḷavāy and cruelly tortured him to death, without sparing even his family.

These transactions led to an invasion of the Marava country by Ranga Krishṇa. The king of Tanjore sent his general to the help of the Sētupati. A decisive battle was fought, and the Madura troops were beaten back. The boast of Shahji to have 'conquered all the Paṭṭukkoṭṭai country, inhabited by Kaḷḷans, extending to the South, as far as the Pāmbanār', recorded in an inscription of 1686,[25] was probably due to the cession to him by the Sētupati of the territory referred to, in recognition of his services in this campaign.

Christianity.—The progress of Christianity in the reign of Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa is intimately connected with the work of John de Brito in the Madura Mission. Born in Lisbon in 1647 and brought up in high circles, Britto was intended for distinguished political favours. But he was attracted only by the life of a missionary. In spite of the persuasions of his mother and the governing authorities of Portugal, he became a Noviciate in 1662. His knowledge and devotion gradually increased, and he was bent on sacrificing his life for Christianity in India. In 1672 he left for India and lived at Goa for about three years. In March, 1680, he reached Madura with André Freire. He confined his labours to the Marava country, wherein the missionaries had not dared to preach since the terrible persecution of 1669. He worked with gteat zeal, and was made 'Superior' of the Madura Mission in 1683. In 1688 he was appointed 'Procureur de la Mission' and had, therefore, to leave India for the time being.[26]

The disorganized condition of the country added to the difficulities of the missionaries. Yet they persevered in their labour of love. Britto's letter of 1683 contains an account of their anxieties and triumphs. Linga Reḍḍi was a vassal of the Nāyak of Madura, and he had a large Christian population under him, the residence of Vaḍugarpaṭṭi being a big Christian centre. Though a staunch Lingāyat, this chief gave every facility for the spread of the Christian faith. In 1683 the following incident alarmed its followers. When one day Linga Raḍḍi visted his *guru* (religious teacher) to pay his respects to him, the latter, who was a sworn enemy of the Christians, spoke to him in the following stain: 'I am astonished that Your Majesty, renowned for the integrity and profundity of your judgcment, as well as

[25] Appendix D, No. 183.

[26] Bertrand, iii, pp. 405-23; Nelson, pp. 221-1.

for the justice of your government, should allow the preaching, in your dominious, of the faith of the *Parangis* and Paraiyas, and that the priest of this faith should have a house and church at Vaḍugarpaṭṭi, where there is an incessant concourse of immense crowds. I am astonished that you do not severely punish the temerity of this preacher, who orders his disciples to break and profane the *lingam.*' The prince, struck by these words, promised to get exact information, and, returning to his palace, ordered his chief minister to conduct an enquiry into the matter. He asked what the total number of Christains in his dominious wobld be. It was replied: 'Their number! who could count them? They are everywhere. There is not a village where they are not found.' However, no harm was done to the Christians.[27]

Persecution was severe in the Marava Country. While passing with his catechists near Mangalam, Britto was captured by the orders of Kumāra Piḷḷai, the 'governor-general and first minister of the Marava king.' He and his disciples were asked to worship God Śiva, but they refused. Thereupon the Maravas became furious, chained them hand and foot, bound them to the trunks of trees, and thus left them to outrage and torture. They spent a full night in this condition. They were about to be impaled on stakes, when the Sētupati summoned Kumāra Piḷḷai to answer a charge of treason. This event saved them from their impending fate. After a few weeks, they were removed to Ramnad, the capital. Finally, they were restored to freedom and warned not to preach Christianity in the Marava country on pain of death. Regaining his liberty, Britto went to see the Provincial, and, owing to his persuasions, reluctantly consented to sail for Portugal in 1688.[28]

Muttu Vīrappa's Achievements.—The salient feature in the character of Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa was his robust enthusiasm and love of adventure. He seems to have descended to the level of his subjects, to perceive their needs and know their opinions. His visits *incognito* and rapid movements throughout the country, to make his influence felt everywhere, are described in the chronicles. His adventures in Tanjore, Ariyalūr, and Tinnevelly throw into relief these special traits of his.[29] His amiable personality and remarkable individuality stood him in good stead in rehabilitating the affairs of his kingdom, if we are to believe the chronicles. He had the exuberance of youthful vigour, and a degree of condescension not usual in rulers.

27 Bertrand, iii, p. 317.

28 Bertrand, iii, pp. 389-93.

29 Taylor, *O.H.MSS.*, ii, pp. 208-15.

Stories similar to that of 'Alfred and the Burnt Cakes' are narrated of him. His excessive vivacity did not make him forgetful of his ordinary work as a ruler. His roving tours must have introduced an element of effective supervision into the administration. Ranga Krishṇa was, however, wanting in seriousness, and was sometimes disposed to condone the faults and extravagance of his officers. His great achievement of putting his internal affiairs in order was due, in a large measure, to external factors, as already explained. Circumstances favoured his plans in a pre-eminent degree. Though he was well disposed towards the missionaries, they give a dark picture of his administration: 'This cruel prince requited the loyalty of his vassal (the Polegar of "Moullipadi") only by the most iniquitous tyranny; the latter was arrested in the very act of paying homage, despoiled of his jewels, and shut up in a dungeon. At the the same time, his troops pillaged the dominions of this unfortunate Polegar, seized his wives, and tortured them to reveal the place of his hidden treasures.'[30]

Ranga Krishṇa had in him a strong sense of justice, and he was prompt in repairing any injustice done, irrespective even of religious considerations. It is said that a piece of land in Trichnopoly belonging to the Christians was taken possession of by the Hindus, when the former left the city owing to the disastrous wars of Chokkanātha and a temple was constructed on this ground. When the missionaries claimed it some years later, there ensued a dispute, and Ranga Krishṇa interfered on behalf ot the Christians. When his co-religionists complained that they had no place to remove their idols to, he is said to have angrily asked them to throw them into the river.[31] As was usual with his predecessors, he built many temples and choultries and made grants of *agrahāras* in charity. He was unique among the Nâyaks in his ideas of morality. He is said to have been a strict monogamist, and to have dispensed with the *harem*, the usual concomitant of royalty in those days.

Ranga Krishṇa's reign was very short, and circumstances cooperated with him in all his endeavours. Therefore it is too much to hazard an opinion about his greatness. As generally, Mr. Rangachari hovers between extreme views: he now makes Ranga Krishṇa a hero. Indulging in historical might-have-beens, he says: 'If Ranga Krishṇa had continued to live, he would in all probability have postponed the subjugation of his kingdom by the Mughals.'[32]

30 Bertrand, iii, p. 400.

31 *Ibid.*, iv, pp, 112-3; Lockman, i, p. 477: Nelson, p. 210.

32 *I.A.*, 1917, p. 124.

However, the available evidence tends to show that Ranga Krishṇa was at best a ruler of considerable ability, quite unlike his father Chokkanātha.

His Death.—That Ranga Krishṇa died of smallpox is recorded in a Jesuit letter[33]. The year of his death is Śukla (1689), according to the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts* ; it is Pramōdūta (1690), according to the *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle* and the *Maduraittalavaralāṟu*. A Jesuit letter of 11th December, 1700, refers to Mangammāḷ's grandson as 'a Prince about fourteen or fifteen years of age, to whom the Kingdom belongs'.[34] As Ranga Krishṇa had only a posthumous son, he must have died at the latest about 1689, if this statement is worthy of belief. But as no chronicle gives less than seven years for his rule, it may be accepted that Ranga Krishṇa died in 1689. The inscription of Mangammāḷ, dated 1687,[35] seems to be prior to her regency.

33 Lockman, i. p. 460. *Vide* Appendix B, Letter, No. 3.
34 Bertrand, iv, p. 74; Lockman, i, p. 461. *Vide* Appendix B, Letter No. 3.
35 Appendix D, No. 195.

Chapter XII

THE REGENCY OF MANGAMMĀḶ

(1689-1706)

At the death of Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa, his wife Muttammāḷ was pregnant. She was so grieved at the loss of her husband that she was prepared to commit *sati* (self-immolation) even before her delivery. But persuasion was effective in postponing the execution of her resolve. Soon after giving birth to a male child, she committed suicide, in spite of the strong remonstrances of Mangammāḷ, her mother-in-law. Ranga Krishṇa's son was named Vijayaranga Chokkanātha, and crowned king when he was only three months olt; therefore, Mangammāḷ, his grandmother, became regent. When her husband Chokkanātha died, she did not commit *sati*, as she was a politically-minded woman, to whom affairs of state mattered more than the satisfactiold of a popular sentiment.[1]

The regency of Mangammāḷ is remarkable for her careful stewardship of the affairs of the kingdom. Though she had to go to war on many occasions, she was fonder of the victories of peace. Her success was principally due to her politic submission to Moghul supermacy. Her regency synchronized with a period when the Moghul emperor, Aurangzib, was practical master of the Dakhan, and was free to direct his armies to the far south. She realized her weakness and her enemy's strength, and tactfully bowed to the Moghul power, with the result that the kingdom of Madura obtained a further lease of life.

About 1693 Zulfikar Khan, who was occupied with the siege of Gingi, sent an army to the south and exacted tribute from Trichinopoly and Tanjore.[2] This policy of humble submission to the Moghul

[1] No doubt popular sentiment was the ruling motive in the performance of *sati*, but it was not obligatory on any except young childless widow without a legitimate protector to go to. Mangammāḷ could hardly be brought under this category in respect of any of the conditions involved.—*Ed.*

Taylor, *O. H. MSS.*, ii, pp. 216-7; Bertrand, iv, pp. 206-7. *Vide* Appendix A Letter No. 12.

[2] Scott's *Ferishta*, ii, p. 81; Wilks, i, p. 59.

was also probably forced on Mangammāḷ by the action of the neighbouring rulers of Mysore and Tanjore. Even the powerful Chikkadēva Rāya (who purchased Bangalore from Ekoji in 1687 and consolidated his dominions) had conciliated the Moghuls, and, under the cover of imperial protection, was extending the boundaries of his kingdom. Shahji of Tanjore was not disposed to resist imperial advance, and he became a tributary of the Great Moghul. Mangammāḷ could not, therefore, have prudently followed a policy of flouting the imperial authority. She tried to draw the best out of her connection with the Moghul empire. When Zulfikar Khan came to the south again in 1697, Mangammāḷ sent costly presents to him, and, with his help, recovered some places in her kingdom captured by the Tanjore ruler. The following extract from Manucci confirms the attitude of Mangammāḷ towards the Moghul emperor: 'On April 20, 1702, Daud Khan received a letter from the Queen of Terchenepali (Trichinopoly), tributary to the Moghul, wherein this ruler begged him to undertake in person to assist her in the war she was obliged to wage against the prince of Aurpaliam (Uḍaiyārpāḷaiyam), another tributary of the Moghul. This man had seized some of her towns. The letter stated with much exaggeration the iniquity of the Raja's proceedings, and was filled with humble words and prayers intended to influence the general to come to her aid. With it came some very fine presents to be sent on to Aurangazebe, some for Daud Khan and some for the *diwan*. They consisted in a number of valuable trinkets and precious stones for the King, 20,000 rupees in silver coin for the general, and 10,000 for the *diwan*—a metal with more virtues in the eyes of these gentry than the most polished orations of the most loquacious tongues'.[3] Daud Khan regretted his inability to come to her assistance in person but sent some troops. Thus Mangammāḷ worked in loyal subordination to the Moghuls, and utilized the imperial forces to some extent in dealing with her enemies. She understood the disorderly condition of the times, and adjusted her policy to the exigencies of the state. She saved the kingdom from shipwreck by skilfully bowing before the storm; she stooped only to conquer. She conserved her energies to maintain the power and prestige of the kingdom as against lesser enemies. She did not commit the folly of matching her strength with the resources of a big empire. She seems to have realized the plans of Aurangzib, and submitted to them in so far as they did not cut at the root of the integrity of her dominions. Manucci remarks: 'It is his (Aurangzib's) practice to denude them (the southern kingdoms) slowly of their wealth, then of their territory, finally of their life.'[4] Mangammāḷ

[3] *Storia do Mogor*, iii, *p*. 411.

[4] *Ibid.*, ii, p. 444.

seems to have prevented the fruition of this imperial scheme, if it was as comprehensive as Manucci says. She did not scruple to bribe and cajole the imperial generals to the best of her resources and ability. It was this policy of timely submission that saved the kingdom from ruin in the time of Mangammāḷ. Though she conciliated the Moghuls, her alliance with them did not secure her kingdom from other enemies. Aurangzib was far from being an efficient source of help to Madura in her troubles. The Mahratta peril was not put an end to, and Mangammāḷ was driven to the necessity of making compulsory payments to the Mahrattas. She had to save the kingdom by resorting to her treasury frequently.

Mysore Aggression—While Mangammāḷ was engaged in settling her policy towards the Moghul empire, Chikkadēva Rāya was pursuing a vigorous campaign of territorial expansion. By 1690 he was in possession of a large part of the Baramahals and of Salem upto the Kaveri. Between 1690 and 1694, he conquered most of the territories of Bednore, and concluded a treaty which confirmed him in the possession of most of his conquests. Soon after, he directed his arms against Madura. Aurangzib's fear of the Mahrattas made his attitude friendly towards Mysore for the time being, though he was not really inclined to spare her. Chikkadeva invaded the territories of Salem and Coimbatore, and made the local chiefs subordinate to him. An inscription at Avanāśi of 1695-6 records a grant by his prime minister.[5] Daḷavāy Kumāraiya was sent to lay siege to Trichinopoly. He is said to have vowed not to return to Mysore without capturing the city. But an attack of the Mahrattas on Mysore led to his recall. Mangammāḷ's burden was thus lightened, and she seems to have successfully repelled the Mysore army.[6]

Relations with Travancore.—We saw before how Tirumala Nāyaka's invasion of Travancore left a lasting impression on the king of that country, and how even about 1664 he, in constant dread of the Nāyak power, was maintaining a strong garrison in his capital for the defence of the kingdom. The political entanglements and weakness of Madura during the reign of Chokkanātha seem to have changed his attitude towards his overlord of Madura. It is said that the Malayāḷam ruler (the king of Travancore) came to Tinnevelly[7] with many rich presents to tender homage to Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka.[8] It is also remarked in the chronicles that, while

[5] Appendix D, No. 202.

[6] Wilks, i. pp. 58-60.

[7] This may be Umayamma Rāṇi, the Queen Regent (1677-84).

[8] Taylor, *O.H. MSS.*, ii, p. 215,

Mangammāḷ was carrying on the administration of the country, the Malayāḷa people did not pay the usual tribute;[9] and, therefore, the former had to declare war against them. This war of Mangammāḷ with Travancore is confirmed by Jesuit accounts, which give the cause of hostilities in more detail.[10] An Inscription at Vaḍaśēri, dated 1697, records remission of taxes to the people of Nānjināḍ for thirteen years on account of the Nāyak invasion.[11]

The king of Travancore, Ravi Varma, seems to have taken advantage of the troubles of Madura in the early days of Mangammāḷ's regency and refrained from paying tribute. Consequently, every year an army was sent to Travancore to collect the dues by force. The weakness of the king of Travancore and the rebellious attitude of his ministers, who had usurped all royal authority, made united action impossible. Hence the Nāyak army pillaged the country and returned home with the spoils. It would have been easy to stop such annual visitations if the pass near 'Cotate' (viz., the Aramboly Pass) had been strongly guarded. But internal factions led to passive acquiescence on the part of Travancore, and the country suffered much from the incursions of the Madura army. About 1696 Ravi Varma is said to have conceived a daring plan to free himself at one stroke from the two perils which were preying upon him, viz. the overbearing ministers and the Madura invasions. The 'Baḍagas' (the Madura army) invaded Travancore as usual to exact the customary tribute. They marched unopposed very near to 'Korkulam',[12] the capital and chief fort of the kingdom. Ravi Varma adopted a very dangerous policy. He came to an understanding with the 'Baḍagas' by promising them a part of his dominions and the fortress of 'Korkulam' in return for their assistance against his eight ministers (*Eṭṭuviṭṭil Piḷḷamār*) who had deprived him of all power in his kingdom. He gave up the citadel to them and, with their help, murdered some of the ministers, the rest of them escaping or ransoming their lives. When the ministerial clique was thus destroyed, he became alive to the dangers

9 This refractory attitude may have commenced with the accession of Ravi Varma (1684-1718).

10 Bertrand, iv, pp. 18-20; Lockman, i, pp. 367-70. *Vide* Appendix B, Letter No. 2.

11 Appendix D, No. 204.

12 Nelson (p. 225) identifies this place with Quilon. But from the Jesuit letters it is clear that it was not far from the borders of the kingdom of Travancore. Nieuhoff (p. 266. *Vide* Appendix C) speaks of Kalkolang as the capital city upon the confine o the kingdom of Madura, and it may be the same as Korkulam. The proper from was probably Kālkuḷam.

attending on his hazardous course of entrusting his capital to his most powerful enemy. Without losing courage, he suddenly turned against them and laid siege to the fort. The 'Baḍagas' fled in confusion, but most of them were pursued and massacred. The Madura army was completely lost, and only a few survived to carry the tale of these tragic incidents home.

It appears probable that Mangammāḷ's expedition to Travancore about 1697 was occasioned by the circumstances detailed above. The events of this punitive campaign are briefly noticed by a chronicle.[18] A large army was sent to Travancore under Daḷavāy Narasappaiya. After a hard struggle, he came out victorious and dictated his own terms. All the arrears of tribute were collected, and valuable presents of jewellery received. The most remarkable of the trophies which were highly prized by the Daḷavāy were some pieces of ordnance. They are said to have been carefully numbered and preserved in the bastions of the Madura and Trichinopoly forts: but Nelson did not succeed in his attempt to trace them.

The Tanjore War.—We have seen that Mangammāḷ had troubles with king Shahji of Tanjore from the commencement of her regency, and that she sought the help of the Moghuls to check the aggressions of this Mahratta ruler by peaceful means. But she gradually realized that, in relying on the Moghul empire for the safety of her dominions, she was leaning on a broken reed. Shahji continued his aggressive policy and captured some of the towns of Madura. His raids into the kingdom were deeply resented by Mangammāḷ, who was constrained to declare war against him about 1700. Daḷavāy Narasappaiya was given charge of this campaign against Tanjore. He entrenched himself strongly on the nothern side of the Coleroon to prevent the devastation of the country by the army of Tanjore. But he could not overcome the excellent cavalry tactics of his enemy. He realized that an offensive operation alone would constitute the best defence. Therefore he crossed the river stealthily and safely, and harried the kingdom of Tanjore. The Tanjore army was dismayed. Neglecting the defences of the capital, it tried to cross the river to counteract this move of the Madura Daḷavāy. But a wrong place was chosen for the crossing at a time when the river was in full flood, with the result that several men and horses were washed away by the current. Confusion set in, and the Tanjore army became panic-stricken. At this juncture the Madura Daḷavāy fell on the Tanjore forces and completely routed them. The kingdom was devastated, and the news

[18] Taylor, *O.H. MSS.*, ii, p. 224.

of this triumph spread far and wide. Shahji was very much disheartened and his fury was kindled, as he suspected foul play on the part of his chief minister, Baloji or Vagoji Pundit. The latter became the target of popular indignation also. Undaunted by the machinations of his enemies, who wanted to discredit and ruin him, he approached his master and assured him that he could conclude an honourable peace with the enemy within a week, pleadging his life in case of failure. This respite was granted, and Baloji sent his secretaries to the prominent merchants of the locality and its neighbourhood, and succeeded in getting a large loan. He tapped all possible sources of money, not sparing even the public treasury. In three or four days he collected, it is said. about, 5,00,000 crowns and lavishly bribed most of the Madura ministers, and principally the greedy father of the Daḷavāy. By skilful diplomacy, he negotiated a peace between Madura and Tanjore, and returned to his master in great exultation. His startling success strengthened his position in Tanjore and disarmed his internal enemies.[14]

In a short time an exhibition was made of this newly cemented alliance. The king of Mysore constructed a big dam across the Kaveri with the idea of diverting all the waters of the river to his kingdom. He thought too exclusively of the advantages which would accrue to himself from this scheme to consider its disastrous consequences for the kingdoms of Madura and Tanjore. Even though the winds, the forerunners of rain, had blown in that year much earlier than usual, the Kaveri was dry, and the rulers of Madura and Tanjore came to know of the cause of this unexpected occurrence. Their wrath was roused at the prospect of an imminent drought and famine, and they planned a joint invasion of Mysore to punish the mischief done to their interests by Chikkadēva Rāya. Before they could complete their preparations, they were surprised to see floods in the river. The dam constructed by the king of Mysore was strong enough only for moderate rainfall; but when heavy rains swelled the waters of the river, the anicut gave way, and his plans were totally ruined.[15] Though a failure, Chikkadēva

[14] Bertrand, iv, pp. 120-2; Lockman, ii, pp. 285-7. *Vide* Appendix B, Letter No. 4.

[15] Bertrand, iv, pp. 182-3; Lockman., ii, pp. 300-301. *Vide* Appendix B, Letter No. 4.

Chikkadēvarāja Udaiyār of Mysore was essentially a great constructive administrator. This magnificent effort at irrigation was concentrated upon the irrigation canal, which even now goes by the name Chikkadēvarāja Sāgara and is an exceedingly fruitful undertaking as it is the source of the fertility of a considerable position of the district of Mysore. The canal takes off from the Kaveri where the level of the river is high: it is then carried over the side of a hill, where it rises to

Rāya's scheme of irrigation proved a brilliant anticipation of one of the most gigantic engineering feats of modern times. His fertile brain planned far above the resources of his age. His attempt led to the strengthening of the new-born friendship between Madura and Tanjore.

The Marava Affairs—The power of Raghunātha Sētupati, the *Kiḷavan*, was gradually growing, as Rama Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka did not succeed in curbing his overbearing attitude. He pursued an independent policy in his administration. We shall see how his vigorous campaign of persecution against Christianity culminated in the martyrdom of John de Britto, and how he cared little about wounding the susceptibilities of Mangammāḷ in this respect. The latter's difficulties gave him an opportunity to free himself from the control of Madura. Martin's letter of 1700[16] refers to the practical independence of the Maravas and their paying what tribute they liked to Madura. About 1698, it is said, they laid siege to Madura, captured it, and retained possession of it for some time. Soon Narasappaiya drove them out of this stronghold.

In 1702 Mangammāḷ had to undertake an expedition against the Sētupati, probably owing to his co-operation with Tanjore in her war against Shahji in 1700. Daḷavāy Narasappaiya now secured the help of Tanjore and marched into the Marava country with a strong army. But the Sētupati was more than a match for him, and he (the Daḷavāy) lost his life in the campaign. The Madura army was defeated, most probably because it had been exhausted by several year's campaigning. Moreover, the Marava army possessed great cohesion and energy. It was recruited almost entirely from one stock of people, who were for long trained to predatory warfare. The Marava country was so organized that the Sētupati could collect even 30,000 or 40,000 men in the course of a week. This numerical and instrinsic superiority of the Maravas was an important factor in securing their independence of Madura at a time when the

some height, and, after proceeding a certain distance, is led into the Kaveri again at a point, where the river runs a great deal below the level of the ground. It is acknowledged generally that the idea of controlling the floods of a river at the head of the detla and making use of the water for purposes of irrigation was probably originated by the Hindus, and the Kaveri anicut is one of the earliest known instances. Chikkadēvarāja's canal was only a further development of the idea and need not be considered impossible even for eighteenth-century India. It was no doubt an anticipation of the great project at Kaṇṇambāḍi now; there is nothing original in the idea of the Kaṇṇambāḍi dam. Its magnitude no doubt is great and the benefit derived thereform may be far greater, but the underlying principle is the same.—*Ed.*

16 Lockman, i, p. 453. *Vide* Appendix B, Letter No. 3.

latter had frittered away her strength in many military undertakings, and when her army was only a medley of divergent interests. Thus, about 1702, the *Kiḷavan* Sētupati severed his connection with Madura and became an independent ruler.[17] Soon he strengthened the fortifications of Ramnad. In 1709, he defeated the Tanjore army which invaded his kingdom, when it was desolated by famine and cyclonic floods, and the latter had to sue for peace.[18] He also captured the strong fortress of Arantāngi from Tanjore.[19] Mangammāḷ failed to subdue her turbulent vassal. Before her death, Ramnad became a separate kingdom.

Christianity.—Christianity underwent strange vicissitudes during this period. The most noteworthy event is the continuation of the work of Britto and its tragic end. De Britto returned to the scene of his past labours (the Marava country) in 1691 in spite of the threat offered to his life by Raghunātha Sētupati. He was not scared away by the dangers which were sure to follow his persistent effort, to preach Christianity in the very teeth of persecution. Not a moment passed without his encountering perils from his enemies robbers, and wild beasts. He did not trouble to protect his life from epidemics and dangerous storms, from floods and ferocious animals. He would not recede from his mission of sacrificing his life for the altar. He succeeded in converting a number of people, the chief among whom was a Marava prince named Taḍiya Tēva, the supposed heir to the Ramnad throne, whose claims were overlooked as against those of the *Kiḷavan* Sētupati. Taḍiya Tēva's youngest wife was the niece of the *Kiḷavan* and she was rejected by her husband after his conversion. She could not brook the loss of her status and forgive Britto, the chief cause of her misfortune. She hurried to the court of her uncle, and mourned the sad fate that had overtaken her through no fault of hers. All the enemies of Christianity joined together and prepared the mind of the *Kiḷavan* for meting out condign punishment to Britto. They pointed out that the kingdom was being ruined by the activities of the Christians, and indicated the probability that his own position would be jeopardised by the people embracing Christianity in large numbers and supporting the claims of a Christian like Taḍiya Tēva to the Ramnad throne. The *Kiḷavan* tried to persuade the latter to give up his Christian proclivities ; but he was obstinate and gloried in his conversion. He was not, however, bold enough to punish him severely ; because the defect of his own title to the throne and the high status and influence of his rival, discouraged him from hastening any untoward development.

17 Bertrand, iv, pp. 186 and 200.
18 *Ibid* , pp. 200-201.
19 *Ibid.*, p. 228.

He, therefore, resolved to heap all his revenge on Britto. He gave orders for the destruction of all churches in his kingdom, and the arrest of Britto and his company. On the 8th of January, 1693, the latter were arrested, brought to Ramnad on the 11th, and imprisoned. At this time, Taḍiya Tēva was in the Marava capital, and his influence delayed the punishment intended for Britto, and made the attitude of the Sētupati indecisive. A large Christian population was another factor to be taken into account in deciding the fate of Britto. Hence the Sētupati nominally banished him to the territory of his brother, but sent secret orders to murder him. Britto was taken to Oraiyūr, 'situated on the confines of the Marava country on the river Pāmbār', and he reached the place on the 31st of January. His letter from prison, dated 3rd February, 1693, describes the events which preceded his execution : 'On the 28th of January I was judged and condemned to be executed in the presence of Ranganādadēvan. . . . . I was seperated from the Christians and conducted to his brother Oraiyūrdēvan, to whom he sent secret order to kill me without delay. I arrived here on the 31st of January. . . . . I am expecting death with impatience; it has always been the object of my desire; it is now the most precious recompense to my work and sacrifice. . . . All the crime I am charged with is the teaching of the law of true God and the weaning of the worshippers from their idols. The soldiers watch me. I cannot write more. . .'[20] There were some obstacles in the way of the carrying out of the order of execution, as the wife of Oraiyūrdēvan was a Christian woman, but Murugappa Piḷḷai, the chief minister, was an inveterate enemy of Christianity. He gave the signal for execution on the 4th of February, 1693, in the following words ; 'Considering that this *guru* (religious teacher) prevents the worship of our gods, and that the sect he propagates makes progress daily and spreads over the whole country, in the name of the king, I order you to cut off his head.'[21] Britto was murdered, and his dead body is said to have been horribly mutilated and exposed to vultures.[22]

Nelson truly remarks that the 'murder of John De Britto, so far from injuring the cause of Christianity, appears to have advanced it very considerably'. Any how, it is difficult to question the sincerity of the *Kiḷavan* Sētupati in taking such a drastic step to uproot Christianity. He seems to have believed that the safety of his crown and the interests of his kingdom demanded such a stern policy. He could not repress the surging wave of Hindu feeling, which emanated from

[20] Bertrand, iii. p. 447.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 448.

[22] For a complete life of Britto, see *Ibid.*, pp. 405-55 ; Nelson pp. 217-25.

the damaging attacks of Britto on idol-worship and Hinduism in general. However, the Sētupati's calculation was a failure, and Christianity flourished in the Marava country after the matryrdom of Britto. He himself relented later on and extended his sympathy to this persecuted faith in his last days.

Martin's letter of 1st June, 1700,[23] refers to the persecution of Christians which was sometimes attended with personal violence. Father Bernard Saa was severely handled and he even lost some of his teeth; his disciples were mercilessly scourged. It is said that the feelings of the people in general were excited against Christianity. Till about 1700, i.e., for seven or eight years after the murder of Britto, the Sētupati did not turn back from his policy of extirpating the Christian religion from his dominions. Gradually the situation improved. The supposed miracles performed by the manglep remaini of Britto, and the death of Oraiyūrdēvan and his minister, shortly after his murder, worked on the imagination of the people and created a sympathetic atmosphere for the Christians. While these circumstances stayed the hands of the persecutors, the cause of Christianity was reinforced by the friendly attitude towards it of Vaḍuganātha Tēva, 'the eldest son of the Sētupati'. The missionaries were emboldened to enter the Marava country; and, in the first decade of the eighteenth century, recruits to Christianity gradually increased.

While Christianity was having a chequered career in the Ramnad country, it enjoyed a large measure of freedom in Madura. Mangammāḷ showed great tolerance towards Christian preachers and her Christian subjects. As early as 1691 she is said to have ordered the liberation of Father Mello, who was languishing in the Marava prison awaiting death. Even in Madura the missionaries had their own share of minor troubles. Father Bouchet had to dismiss three catechists for moral delinquency. The latter rallied the enemies of Christianity to their side, and attempted to discredit the missionaries. The following charges were brought against them: (1) That they were *Parangis,* (2) that they were a burden to the kingdom, because they paid no revenue, though their income was large, and (3) that they murdered a Friar. Father Bouchet felt very anxious and resolved to interview Daḷavāy Narasappaiya, though the latter was well-known for his great aversion to Europeans, as became evident from his dismissing some able and experienced gunners from the army at a time when he was engaged in a war, because he learned that they were Europeans. Bouchet carried with him some curious presents, and he was received with great con-

23 Bertrand, iv, pp. 64-5; Lockman, i, pp. 387-8. *Vide* Appendix B, Letter No. 2.

sideration by the *Daḷavāy*, who is *eulogised as the greatest minister* that ever governed Madura. The Father had a minute knowledge of the court ceremonials, and he scrupulously avoided giving room for any suspicions about him. He skilfully ingratiated himself into the favour of the Daḷavāy by making pointed reference to his heroic actions and victories. He laid special emphasis on the Christian law, which enjoined on subject obedience to their sovereign. The Daḷavāy in his turn complimented Bouchet, and then conveyed his presents to Mangammāḷ, who asked her minister to thank the Father in her name and grant him all his requests. The Daḷavāy openly proclaimed in court the wishes of the Queen. Bouchet expressed his indebtedness to the Daḷavāy and took leave of him, reiterating his request for royal protection of Christianity. The interview came to an end, and the Father was taken in procession with great pomp throughout the city, by the orders of the Daḷavāy, and conducted to his residence, which was about four leagues off. This successful diplomatic mission of Bouchet gave him strength to deal with the apostates who were working against him. He published an order of excommunication against them. Soon two of them re-entered the Christian fold, while the third apostate persisted in his inimical attitude towards the Father. Thus the impending storm against Christianity was averted by the timely manoeuvres of Bouchet.[24]

Martin's account of this interview of Bouchet with Daḷavāy Narasappaiya gives a glowing picture of the success of Christianity and the respect it commanded in the kingdom. But, as Taylor remarks, 'it is an *ex parte* statement; yet probably does not depart much from the truth, though there are some other portions of the letter in question which apparently require to be received with some qualification.'[25] Anyhow, the benevolent attitude of Mangammāḷ towards Christianity is clear. This is confirmed by the following extract from Manucci. This king of Tanjore, not satisfied with what he had done in his own territories against the Christians, wished still farther to have them persecuted and brought to destruction within the kingdoms of the princes, his neighbours. With this object he wrote, while still impelled by his rage, while the fire of his wrath was still burning, to the Queen of Madura and the King of Aurpaliam (Uḍaiyārpālaiyam), representing to them the danger they incurred for their temples and even for their thrones if they did not expel the Christians—at any rate, if they did not hinder the free exercise of that religion and forbid the baptism of any of their

24 Bertrand, iv, pp. 72-81 ; Lockman, i, pp. 459-69. *Vide* Appendix, B Letter No. 3.

25 *O. H. MSS.*, ii, p. 227.

subjects. . . .The first of these potentates answered that, just as some were allowed to eat rice and others meat, so also was it lawful for *each man to practise or adopt whatever religion seemed to him the* best. As for the King of Aurpaliam, he did not preserve so favourable an attitude towards the Christians as did the Queen of Madura. It is also true that he did not treat them with the rigour and severity that had been exercised in Tanjore. He was content to give orders to arrest four Jesuit missionaries, then within his territory, but their reverences were warned, and "preserved themselves for their country". (They bolted). The King, having missed arresting their persons, made sure of their property and of all that was to be found in their house. But the Christians were not touched.'[26]

This extract exhibits in bold relief the enlightened religious policy of Mangammāḷ as against the rude campaign of persecution followed by the neighbouring rulers and the Sētupati. Thus Mangammāḷ shone far above her contemporaries in her attitude towards religion.

Mangammāḷ's Character and Work.—Mangammāḷ was a *femme politique.* Her vigour and diplomacy gave the Nāyak kingdom a longer tenure of life than it would otherwise have had. She found the kingdom weak and decrepit, threatened by dangers all around. By accepting the Moghul supremacy she conserved her energy and resources to direct them against the less powerful enemies of the kingdom. With unerring judgment she knew what she could achieve. Though it must be admitted that she was no match for the Sētupati, she conducted many wars with ability and success; but the remarkable powers of her Daḷavāy, Narasappaiya, constituted a valuable asset and her chief mainstay. Her prudent administration in an age of storm and stress marks her out as a ruler of high repute.

Mangammāḷ's attitude towards Christianity has been adverted to. She was equally considerate towards other religions. She did not alienate her Muhammadan subjects. A copper plate inscription of 1692[27] records a grant for the maintenance of a mosque in the name of her grandson. In 1701 she made a gift of some villages near Trichinopoly for a Muhammadan *daraga.*[28] Her grants to Hindus are numerous. Though a devout woman, she respected the religious feelings of others.

Mangammāḷ's name has become proverabial for liberality. Inscriptions record her donations to temples and for public charity. She is famous as a roadmaker, though she buit some artistic public edifices like the choultry, which is called after her name, and, according

26 *Storia do Mogor,* iii, pp. 332-3.
27 Appendix D, No. 198.
28 *Ibid.,* No. 210.

to some, the *Tamagam* (summer house). She provided for the comfort of pedestrians by planting trees on the roads she constructed and repaired, and placing inns and supplies of water on the way. An inscription of 1701[29] records a grant of land for a feeding institute. She made many grants of *agrahāras*. She seems to have devoted much of her attention to irrigation, as is indicated by her inscriptions on the bank of the Uyyakkoṇḍān Channel in 1687 and 1704.[30] Her greatness is reflected in popular tradition, which draws a strikingly contrasted picture of Mangammāḷ and Chikkadēva Rāya, the niggardly king of Mysore.[31] Idle stories are current about Mangammāḷ's object in organizing charity on such an elaborate scale, but they are too puerile to deserve serious consideration.[32]

Mangammāḷ's Death.—Nelson says that Mangammāḷ died under tragic circumstances. It is said that the queen became unpopular during the last two or three years of her life, because of her scandalous relationship with her minister Achchaiya. This unpopularity increased when she showed unwillingness to hand over the reins of government to her grandson when he attained majority. Consequently she was arrested, imprisoned, and starved, Tantalus-like, until at last she died. This is oral tradition.[33] Nelson thinks that 'there is nothing *prima facie* improbable in it as it stands, and there exists some evidence tending to corroborate it.'[34] The confirmatory evidence alluded to here is a supposed statue of Achchaiya, and a portrait of Mangammāḷ with her alleged paramour, in which the latter is dressed in unorthodox fashion and gaudily decked with jewellery. But the statue and the portrait do not constitute decisive evidence, as they give very meagre and doubtful information about this affair. The most obvious improbability in the story is that, at the time ascribed for this love intrigue, Mangammāḷ would be about fifty-five years old.[35] The Jesuit authorities who refer to Mangammāḷ have nothing to say about her unnatural death. If it was a fact, they would have made much capital out of it; for she was their friend, and they would have seized on such on effective weapon against their enemies. All that can be said on the evidence available is that there is no valid ground for believing that Mangammāḷ met with a tragic death.

[29] *Ibid.*, No. 209.

[30] *Ibid.*, Nos. 195 and 211.

[31] Taylor, *O.H.MSS.*, ii. pp. 224-6.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 224; Nelson, p. 216.

[33] Taylor, *O.H.MSS.*, ii, p. 226.

[34] p. 237.

[35] In 1682 Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Virappa was, according to the Jesuit letters, fifteen years old, and therefore Mangammāḷ must have been at least past thirty then, and hence in 1705 she would be about fifty-four or fifty-five.

Mangammāḷ's regency lasted for eighteen years, according to the *History of the Carnataca Governers, Supplementary Manuscript*, and a *Mackenzie Manuscript.*[36] The *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscript* gives nineteen years. The *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle* gives only twelve years. This means that the regency must have come to an end about 1700, and this view is opposed to the evidence of inscriptions and the Jesuit letters. It is, however, clear that her death happened after that of Chikka-dēva Rāya of Mysore.[37] Wilks[38] ascribes the later event to the 12th of December, 1904. There is an inscription of Mangammāḷ in 1706-7.[39] The earliest inscription of her successor, Vijayaranga Chokkanātha, as ruler, belongs to 1708 or 1710, if the Śaka or the cyclic year is to be taken as correct.[40] His earlier inscription of 1692, 1695, and 1700 belong to a period when Mangammāl was the ruler beyond doubt. Therefore 1706 may be taken as the date of Mangam-māḷ's death, as it is epigraphically supported. In that case, her regency would have lasted for about eighteen years.[41]

[36] Taylor, *O.H.MSS.*, ii, p. 229.

[37] *Ibid.*, pp. 225-6.

[38] i, p. 131.

[39] Appendix D, No. 212.

[40] Appendix D. No. 214.

[41] Mr. Rangachari's account of Mangammāḷ is not without errors common to his history. With regard to her administration, he makes the following statements: 'Mangammāḷ carried on the affairs of state with a remarkable capacity for *fifteen years* after his (Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa's) death' in 1689...'*She could hardly fill his place.* The 18th century was not an age for the rule of women in India,...(for) the mild sceptre of a *women.* Mangammāḷ was one among a million women . She failed to secure the independence of her state from Mughal domination'. (*I.A.*, 1917, p.124). Later on Mr. Rangachari remarks that 'endowed with many *masculine* virtues, she proved a *polittcian of no mean talents.* For a space of *seventeen years* (1689-1705) she conducted the affairs of state in such excellent spirit that her regency became, if not a model of good government, at least strong enough to secure order within the state and *victory abroad.* She had a certain vigour and independence of character which ensured the security of her reign and the discomfiture of her enemies ..The real work of consoli-dation...devolved on Mangammāḷ. And she proved not unequal to the task. Her remarkable vigour made her regency, when compared with that (*sic*) of her predecessors, one of tranquility and progress. During the period of 15 *years* during which she swayed the destinies of Madura ...'(*Ibid.*, pp. 157-8.) Thus Mr. Rangachari's estimate of Mangammāḷ's achievements, and the period he ascribes to her rule have varying connotation and denotation. Further, he places the commencement of Vijayaranga Chokkanātha's rule in 1706. (*Ibid.*, p. 186.) Therefore Mangammāḷ is said to have ruled for fifteen years and seventeen years, and died in 1705 and 1706. Another characteristic of Mr. Rangachari's work is his attempt to express final judgments on historical questions, as is attested by his statement that 'the true cause and excuse of Mangammāḷ's death, therefore, is, and is ever likely to be, a mystery'. (*Ibid.*, p.185). Moreover, he does not avoid exhibiting the views, in his own language, of 'a historian whose views are of a most unreliable nature'. (*Ibid.*, p. 184.) Mr. Rangachari seems to be an inveterate lover of romance and does not try to extricate history from its clutches.

CHAPTER XIII

VIJAYARANGA CHOKKANĀTHA
(1706-32)

Vijayaranga Chokkanātha assumed the reins of government in 1706. His reign is only a record of the sufferings of the country, and its downward march to disruption and ruin. The fatal indifference of the king to the affairs of state, and his absorption in other work, gave a free hand to his ministers, whose maladministration hastened the break-up of the kingdom. The weakness of the central government gave a strong stimulus to the play of centrifugal tendencies. The higher officials were greedy and lacking in grit. Oppression of the people seems to have been the chief work of the ministers. In an inscription of 8th March 1712, Kastūri Rangaiya is mentioned as the Daḷavāy, and Venkaṭakrishṇaiya as the Pradhāni.[1] Unauthorized and tyrannical collection of taxes seems to have led to hostile demonstrations against the administration. An inscription of 1710 refers to temple servant throwing himself down from the temple tower as a protest against undue taxation of some tax-free villages, and the consequent yielding of the state officials-an effective course of 'passive resistance'.[2] So early in the reign matters reached a climax. The king's attention was mainly devoted to religious practices and gifts. He is said to have taken the administration of the *Dēvasthānam* (temple mangement) into his own hands, and rivalled Tirumala Nāyaka in his arrangements with regard to temple affairs.[3] He made grants to institutions (*maṭhas*) is distant places like Tirukkaḷukuṉṟam in 1717 and Sōsāle in 1708.[4] He went on long pilgrimages to important shrines at very short intervals. To official mismanagement were added the miseries of the people due to famine between 1710 and 1720. The inscriptions[5] of the Mysore rulers in Salem and Coimba-

[1] Appendix D, No. 218.

[2] *Ibid.*, No. 216.

[3] *Maduraittalavaṟṟlāṟu*. *Vide* Appendix E.

[4] Appendix D, Nos. 225 and 215.

[5] A sale deed of *Doḍḍa Krishṇa Uḍaiyār* in 1714 at Eṭappūr (*Ibid.*, No. 221). An inscription of 1722 recalls the achievements of *Chikkadēva Rāya*, who is said *to* have 'emulated the sports of Krishṇa in conquering the lord of Madura' (*Ibid.*, No. 220). There are numerous other inscriptions of Krishṇa Rāja Uḍaiyār.

tore show that this part of the Madura kingdom was irretrievably lost. Towards the end of his reign, Vijayaranga Chokkanātha seems to have enjoyed a queit time. In 1726 the king of Travancore applied to him for help against his internal enemies.[6]

The Marava Kingdom.—The *Kiḻavan* Sētupati died in 1710, according to the Jesuit authorities;[7] and the earlist inscription of his successor is in 1730.[8] Mr, Rangachari does not seem to be quite sure of the period of this Sētupati's rule. Not only does he not give the authority for his dates, but makes mutually discordant statements. At first he gives the dates 1673 to 1708, i.e., a period of thirty-five years;[9] but, later on, he places the *Kiḻavan's* death in 1709 after a rule of twenty-five years.[10] Many instances like this have bee pointed out already. Probably Mr. Rangachari wtote his articles in the *Indian Antiquary* in parts, and did not carefully refer to the remarks he had made before. In this particular case, his contradiction, with regard to both the dates and reign-period, is apparently due to his following Nelson blindly. The latter says that the Sētupati 'commenced a reign destined to extent over a period of no less than thirty -six years'...and that 'the verteran died aged upwards of eighty, and after a reign of a quarter of a century.'[11]

The rule of the *Kiḻavan* lasted from about 1674 to 1710, i.e., for about thirty-six years. He was a man of remarkable ability who conducted the administration of the country with great vigour and wisdom. Though his title to the throne was weak, he succeeded in securing the independence of his dominions and winning the good opinion of his subjects. A rich and powerful Marava asked a Christian catechist : 'How can this religion (Christianity) be good and holy when our king, so full of sagacity, has put its preacher to ignominious death and severely prohibited this doctrine in his dominions?'[12] The Sētupati's violent action against Christianity seems to have been a popular move. He identified himself completely with the interests of his people and his kingdom. During his last years he had to witness the intense sufferings which his people had to undergo owing to the operation of natural causes. Famine and pestilence came in the wake of war and made terrible havoc. A virulent cyclone added to the miseries. This condition of affairs lasted for nearly ten years after his death.

6 Caldwell, *History of Tinnevelly*, pp. 253-5.
7 Bertrand, iv, p. 203. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 12.
8 Appendix D, No. 220.
9 *I.A.*, 1917, p. 45.
10 *Ibid.*, p. 209.
11 Nelson, pp. 206 and 244.
12 Bertrand, iii. p. 453.

Before his death the *Kilavan* nominated Bhavāni Śankara Tēva, his illegitimate son, as his successor; but, on representations from his subjects, he approved of their candidate, Vijayaraghunātha, who was crowned Sētupati after him. But in Martin's letter of 1713 Vijayaraghunātha is represented as the second son of the *Kilavan* Sētupati: Vaḍuganātha Tēva is master of a good part of Marava Country. All the kingdom belonged to him by right, for he is the elder; but he gave sovereignty over it to his younger brother, who, he thought, had more talent for government then he."[13] This compliment to the self-abnegation of Vaḍuganātha Tēva is probably gratuitous and due to his love of Christianity. If these two brothers were the sons of the Sētupati, it is inexplicable how the latter's first nomination fell on his illegitimate son, Bhavāni Śankara. That Vijayaraghunātha and Vaḍuganātha were brothers is probable. The Jesuit writers sometimes make the mistake of taking the successors of a ruler for his sons.[14] It appears that popular choice triumphed in the succession of Vijayaraghunātha Tēva.

Though Vijayaraghunātha had the support of the people, he was constantly troubled by his rival, Bhavāni Śankara. Disputed succession became the bane of orderly administration. He resided ordinarily in the fortress of Arantāngi, and kept his forces in readiness for any military undertaking. He was a deeply religious man, who paid frequent vists to Rāmēśvaram and made large donations to the temple there. He also built a number of temples.

His attitude towards Christianity was very favourable in the beginning. Soon after his accessian, he received the missionaries who went to see him, and gave them permission to erect churches in the heart of his dominions. He even granted them a plot of ground and the materials necessary for their construction. Accordingly, a big church was erected in 1711, which is said to have been more beautiful than any of those of Madura.[15] But soon the Sētupati seems to have changed his policy, as the Jesuits complain of bad treatment from him. To counteract this hostility, the Christians had the support of the king's elder brother, Vaḍuganātha Tēva, of whom Martin records that 'this prince received me with distinction and amity, and apologized to me for the bad treatment I had received from his brother.'[16] Consequently, as is remarked, Christianity

[13] Bertrand, iv, p. 228

[14] Tirumala Nāyaka is said to be the son of Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka I. *Ante*. pp. 110 and 115.

[15] Bertrand, iv, p. 208;

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 228.

was in a flourishing condition in the Marava country in 1714-5, and it made progress every day. When the king went to Rāmēśvaram once, he entrusted the government of his dominions to one, 'Tiruvaluvanāthan', his brother-in-law, who is described as a model of piety and virtue among the neophytes.[17] Soon after the king's departure, the latter visited the church and participated in the ceremonies. When information about this reached the Sētupati, he flew into a paroxysm of rage and hurried back to his capital with the resolve to exterminate Christianity from his dominions. He gave orders to his soldiers to enter the houses of Christians and destory all traces of their faith.[18]

About 1720 the famine, which had desolated the country for several years, ceased. Abundant rains revived the people's hope, and the harvest gladdened those who survived the calamity.[19] But unfortunately for the Marava country, Bhavāni Śankara's intrigues brought about a war. He secured the help of the Rāja of Pudukotta and the king of Tanjore, and the confederate army attacked Arantāngi. While the defence of the place was going on, a terrible epidemic made Vijayaraghunātha its victim, and he was taken to Ramnad, where he died soon after in 1720. This was a serious loss to the Maravas, as he was a popular ruler of some ability and his death was the signal for a dispute about the succession which ended in the final collapse of the kingdom. A Jesuit writer gloats over this misfortune, and refers to it as 'the favour of Divine Providence'.[20]

Before the death of the Sētupati, he had nominated one Tānḍa Tēva, a great-grandson of the *Kiḷavan's* father, as his successor. But Bhavāni Śankara, basing his claims to the throne on his nomination by the *Kiḷavan*, tried diplomacy to defeat his rival. Through the support of his 'mother-in-law', the late Sētupati's principal concubine (he had married her niece), he secured popular support and became Sētupati. But Tānḍa Tēva was not prepared to surrender his right without a struggle. He succeeded in getting the help of the king of Madura and the Rāja of Pudukotta to enforce his claims by the promise of territorial cession to the latter. In a short time, he laid siege to Arantāngi; and Bhavāni Śankara, dismayed at the sight of the large army he had to give battle to, hurriedly escaped to Tanjore. The latter concluded an agreement with the king of Tanjore

17 Bertrand, iv, p. 233.

18 *Ibid*, p. 235.

19 *Ibid.*, p. 262.

20 *Ibid.*, pp. 262.

by which he consented to give up all his territories north of the Pāmbār in return for help against his rival. In the course of two or three months Bhavāni Śankara and the Tanjore general invaded Ramnad. Tāṇḍa Tēva called upon his allies for support; Madura sent a few soldiers, and the army of Pudukotta encamped near the allied forces. The Tanjore general easily dispersed the latter, and attacked the former. He was able to take two of the sons of the Rāja of Pudukotta prisoners, and the latter came to terms quickly. After this engagement, Ramnad was laid siege to and the fort was mined and captured. Tāṇḍa Tēva and some of his followers were put to death. Thus after a hard struggle Bhavāni Śankara became Sētupati for the second time.

The administration of this new Sētupati only prepared the way for his fall. He could not retain the affection and loyalty of his vassals. He quarrelled with a powerful and influential chief and confiscated his territories. The latter took refuge in Tanjore, and by his heroic feats, won the favour of the king. He co-operated with another refugee like himself, Kāṭṭaya Tēva, who left Ramnad after its successful siege by Bhavāni Śankara, and succeeded in inducing the king of Tanjore to help him, on condition of ceding him the territories north of the Pāmbār, as Bhavāni Śankara had not fulfilled his promise to the same effect. Accordingly, the Ramnad country was invaded, and in the battle of Uraiyūr, Bhavāni Śankara was defeated and taken prisoner to Tanjore. His rule came to an end in 1729.[21]

The successful campaign of Tanjore against Bhavāni Śankara let to the partition of the Marava country. All the territories north of the Pāmbār were taken by Tanjore, in accordance with the terms of the understanding which preceded her recent Ramnad campaign. The remainder of the country was parcelled out into five portions; three of them were give to Kāṭṭaya Tēva who ascended the throne with the title of Kumāra Muttu Vijayaraghunātha Sētupati, and the other two parts went to the share of the Polegar refugee, the co-adjutor of Kāṭṭaya Tēva, who later on became the Rāja of Śiva-ganga. Thus the original Ramnad country was partitioned among

[21] Mr. Rangachari has not carefully examined the dates he gives. According to him, Vijayaraghunātha ruled from 1709 to 1723, (*I.A.*, 1917, p. 209.) The inaccuracy of this initial date has been pointed out already. The final date is opposed to the Jesuit records, which give the year as 1720. Mr. Rangachari does not note that his dates differ from reliable authorities; nor does he indicate how he has arrived at them. Whatever may be his opinion, whether backed by satisfactory evidence or not, he should at least have taken care that his dates were not mutually conflicting. He allows a period of nine years for Bhavāni Śankara's rule; and therefore it must have been between 1723 and 1732; but he puts the close of it in 1729. (*Ibid.*, pp. 212-3.)

three persons, with the result that the Sētupati ceased to be an influencing factor in politics, and his power was eclipsed by the new ruler of Śivaganga, who, however, could not revive the glories of the united and independent Marava country.[22]

Vijayaranga Chokkanātha's Character and Rule.— Vijayaranga's excessive religious fervour made him unmindful of his duties as king. Besides criminally neglecting his proper functions, he wasted the resources of the kingdom in lavish donations and frequent royal tours to principal shrines. His inscriptions of 1708, 1715, 1716, 1721, 1724, 1727, and 1728[23] record grants of lands and villages to temples and charities. Once in two years he is said to have moved with a large following to Śrīrangam, Jambukēśvaram, Madura, Tinnevelly, Āḷvār-Tirunagari, and Śrī Vaikunṭham, and made liberal gifts to the gods.[24] When he was told that the presents of jewellery and other gifts he had made on a previous occasion were all missing, he would not do so much as institute an enquiry into the malversation, but would repeat his donations.[25] In thus draining the public treasury he showed little sense of responsibility. His ministers Naravappaiya and Venkaṭarāghavāchārya, took advantage of his, weakness and pilfered the public revenues unscrupulously.[26] At a time when the country was hastening to ruin, Vijayaranga Chokkanātha was the last man to be at the head of the realm. Like Vijayarāghava, the last Nāyak of Tanjore, his essentially religious temperament dug the grave of his reputation as a ruler, and accelerated the collapse of his kingdom. He was too weak to control the destructive elements which had been eating into the vitals of the State for some time past. He sealed the fate of the kingdom irretrievably. Like the Tanjore ruler above-mentioned, he was extremely conservative in social matters, as is illustrated by his treatment of the Ceylon embassy, carrying a proposal for marriage into his family. He was horrified at what he considered to be the audacity of the king of Ceylon, because of his inferior caste; and he dismissed the Ceylonese with scant courtesy.[27] Vijayaranga Chokkanātha was a crude and orthodox man, and the work of a ruler was entirely alien to his taste.

22 Nelson, pp. 247-50.

23 Appendix D, Nos. 214, 222, 224, 225, 228, 230, 231 and 232.

24 Taylor, *O.H.MSS.*, ii, pp. 229 and 37.

25 *Ibid.*, p. 230.

26 *Ibid.*, pp. 230-1.

27 Taylor, *O.H.MSS.*, ii. Appendix, pp. 46-7.

His death. — Vijayaranga Chokkanātha died on the 3rd Māśi, Virōdhikrit (about the 15th of February, 1732), according to the *Mṛtyunjaya Manuscripts*; on the Śivarātri day in Māśi, Virōdhikrit, aceordihg to the *Maduraittalavaralāṟu*; and in Māśi, Virōdhikrit, according to the *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle*. The *History of the Carnataca Governers* and the *Supplementary Manuscript* give the same cyclic year. Therefore the chronicles agree in placing the death of Vijayaranga early in 1732. Inscriptions do not conflict with this dating. A copper plate inscription, dated Ś. S. 1653, K. Ā. 907, Virōdhikrit,[28] is the last one 'in the reign of Vijayaranga Chokkanātha'. Consequently, he cannot have died earlier than August–September, 1731. The earliest record of his ruccessor, Mīnākshi,[29] is dated 1733-4. Nelson only says that 'the King seems to have died in the year 1731'.[30] He does not state the grounds for this probability. Mr. Rangachari's date for this event is 1731, but his references indicate the succeeding year, i.e., 1732.[31] As usual he does not support his dating; he fails to justify his choice in the midst of conflicting evidence. The most probable date for the death of Vijayaranga Chokkanātha is February, 1732. Wilks[32] seems to be correct in ascribing this event to the same year.

28 Appendix D, No. 234.

29 *Ibid.*, No. 235.

30 p. 251.

31 *I. A.*, 1917, p. 213.

32 i, p. 154.

CHAPTER XIV

MĪNĀKSHI (1732-6)

MĪNĀKSHI'S short reign of about five years is a record of internal strife followed by foreign occupation and extinction of the Nāyak kingdom. Succession disputes now assumed a serious shape and invited Muhammadan intervention. Though Mīnākshi was an ambitious woman, she was too weak to cope with the complex and dangerous situation. When even heroic remedies could not have saved the kingdom, the rule of a woman of very average abilities, could not but end in disaster.

As Vijayaranga Chokkanātha died without male issue, his wife Mīnākshi assumed the reins of government, and adopted Vijayakumāra, the son of Bangāru Tirumala, who is said to have been a member of another branch of the royal family issuing from Kumāra Muttu, the 'younger brother' of Tirumala Nāyaka. She was supported by her brother, Venkaṭa Perumāḷ Nāyaka. She acted quickly to secure popular recognition for her rule. Soon Bangāru Tirumala, the father of her adopted son, and Daḷavāy Venkaṭāchārya formed an alliance to bring about the deposition of Mīnākshi. It is said that their first attempt to oust her, by entering the fort of Trichinopoly, was a failure. While the struggle between these parties was distracting the kingdom, the Nawab of Arcot sent his son, Safdar Ali, and his son-in-law, Chanda Sahib, about 1734 with a large army to reduce the kingdoms of Madura and Tanjore if they failed to pay tribute. The presence of the foreign army was utilized by Bangāru Tirumala against Mīnākshi; he bribed Safdar Ali to his side. The latter would not hazard an attack on the strong fortress of Trichinopoly under the vigilance of Mīnākshi. Therefore he posed as the arbitrator between the two parties and summoned an imposing conference to keep up the appearance of abjudicating their respective claims on sufficient data. Mīnākshi did not pay any heed to this suspicious attempt at settlement. Safdar Ali decided in favour of Bangāru, and, committing the execution of his award to Chanda Sahib, quitted the scene. Mīnākshi negotiated with the latter with a view to nullifying the arrangements agreed

upon, in return for, it is said, one crore of rupees. Chanda Sahib consented to her terms, and is said to have sworn by the *Koran* to safeguard her interests at any cost. After this he was received by her in her palace.[1] The accounts given by the chonicles are confusing and contradictory. It is said that Mīnākshi had, by this time, reconciled herself with Bangāru, and that she sent him and her adopted son to Madura to save them from Chanda Sahib.

Chanda Sahib understood that the two rivals had come to terms, and therefore he had no opportunity to pit one against the other. Further, he learnt that the conquest of the Madura kingdom would not be an easy affair. Disappointed at the attitude of Mīnākshi, he returned to Arcot. Soon he came again to Trichinopoly, in 1736, with the definite plan of usurping the position of the Queen. He came into the fort and prepared the necessary measures for bringing the whole kingdom under his control. He seems to have persuaded Mīnākshi that her best course lay in entrusting him with the reduction of her enemies. With strange infatuation or impotence, she remained an idle spectator of Chanda Sahib's movements. After gaining control of the administration of the territories in her possession, he strengthened his position in Trichinopoly. Under the command of Gōvindaiya and Rāvaṇaiya, two of the Queen's adherents, he sent a large army, consisting of 80,000 cavalry and some infantry, to the south to take possession of Dindigul, which was in the hands of Bangāru Tirumala, and conquer the whole country. Dindigul was stormed in a short time, and the army of Chanda Sahib marched to Madura. Bangāru Tirumala desperately collected a few troops to oppose the invaders. In the battle of Ammaiya-Nāyakkanūr,[2] his army, which was strengthened by some Polegars, made a bold stand, and fought a well-contested battle, but was overpowered. Bangāru took refuge in Śivaganga, whose Rāja allowed him the use of the fort of Veḷḷikurichchi. The Muhammadan army became masters of the kingdom of Madura. Soon Chanda Sahib's character and ulterior motives stood revealed. He did not scruple to break his solemn vow, and imprison Mīnākshi in her palace.[3] The latter's miseries overwhelmed her, and she put an end to her own life by taking poison.[4] The death of Mīnākshi[5] brought about the practical

1 Wilks, i, p. 155; Taylor, *O. H. MSS.*, ii, p. 233.

2 Taylor. *O. H. MSS.*, ii, p. 234.

3 S. C. Hill, *Yusuf Khan*, p. 12.

4 Taylor, *O. H. MSS*, ii, p. 235.

5 The date of this event is rightly ascribed to 1736 by S. C. Hill (*Yusuf Khan*, p. 26) on a carefull examination of contemporary and other reliable records. Mr. Rangachari, however, puts it in 1737 (*I.A.*, 1917, p. 213).

extinction of the rule of the Nāyaks of Madura. Bangāru Tirumala was not the man to take advantage of this turn in the course of events and lead a vigorous campaign for the expulsion of the Muhammadans; he was too weak for such an undertaking. By calling in the Mahrattas to his aid, he gave up all chance of restoring Nāyak rule. After his murder by Anwaruddin, his son Vijayakumāra fled to Śivaganga, and his descendants lived in obscurity. These later events are treated fully by Nelson,[6] and Mr. Rangachari.[7]

[6] p. 261 *et seq.*

[7] *I. A.*, 1917, pp. 241-7 and 272-5.

Chapter XV

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON NĀYAK RULE

1. Administration

Central Government: King and his Ministers.— We have seen how the Pāḷaiyam System was organized to meet the needs of local government and provide for the military necessities of the kingdom. From the beginning over-centralisation of authority was avoided. The central government was systematised on traditional lines, but certain modifications were introduced to suit the conditions of the times. In theory the King governed with the assistance of a Council of Ministers.

The Daḷavāy was the principal officer of the kingdom, and he combined in himself the control of all civil and military administration. The old Hindu arrangement of having a *Mantri* (chief minister) and a Sēnāpati (commander-in-chief) was not followed, and we see the fusion of the functions of these two officers in the hands of the Daḷavāy. This proved a wise arrangement, as the Nāyaks had always to aim at military efficiency even in civil administration. For a long time after order had been evolved out of chaos, a strong hand was necessary to keep the turbulent chiefs and people in check. Racial conflicts among a heterogeneous population necessitated a combination of civil and military rule, as has been the case with the 'Non-Regulation' provinces of India under the British administration. Problems of state had so frequently a conspicuous military aspect that the separation of civil and military policy would have been prejudicial to orderly administration. The Daḷavāy was practically the master of the kingdom; but, since his powers had no constitutional sanction, strong kings could curtail his authority. Normally he was the supreme power in the state. Under weak rulers, his influence on the administration was great and undisturbed. It seems that the Daḷavāy is referred to by the Jesuit writers and John Nieuhoff as the Governor-General of the kingdom.

The Daḷavāy's functions seem to have been of general nature; he was the officer responsible for the peace of the country, and was

mainly concerned with internal order and foreign policy, thought he may have had some control over the various departments of state. Nelson seems to underestimate the importance of this official when he says[1] that his functions were merely advisory; but Nieuhoff remarks that he was a real power in the affairs of the country, and the Jesuit letters, by many references, indicate his great power, even under Tirumala Nāyaka. The latter authority says that the Daḷavāy who governed the kingdom under the Queen (Mangammāḷ) was 'absolute master and bent all to his will', and refers to him as the Prince-Regent.[2] It appears certain that the Daḷavāy was a power to be counted in the administratiog of the country.

The first great Daḷavāy of the Nāyaks was Ariyanātha, who was also the Pradhāni. The combination of these two offices in his hands did not create a precedent, as, later on, they were kept distinct and held by different persons.[3] An illustrious and worthy successor of Ariyanātha was Rāmappaiya in the reign of Tirumala Nāyaka. The Daḷavāys, Lingama Nāyaka, Venkaṭakrishṇappa, Gōvindappaiya were mediocrities. The famous Narasappaiya, the Daḷavāy of Mangammāḷ, extorted the unstinted admiration of the Jesuits, though he was an inveterate enemy of the Europeans.[4] Achchaiya was a nonentity. Kastūri Rangaiya, Naravappaiya, and Venkaṭarāghavāchārya, the Daḷavāys of Vijayaranga Chokkanātha, were unscrupulous intriguers, who lowered the prestige of their office. Most of the Daḷavāys of the Nāyaks were Brahmans, and, from the time of Chokkanātha, the office was held by a succession of Brahmans.

The next important officer of the King was the Pradhāni, the finance minister. Though principally engaged in directing the collection of revenue and its expenditure he seems to have had great influence on internal administration as a whole, and held a rank higher than that of an ordinary minister. Proenza's letter of 1665 records that 'the Pradhāni,...under the title of the first minister of the king, is the governor or rather the despot of the whole kingdom'.[5] This

[1] p. 145.

[2] Bertrand, iv, p. 74, Lockman i, p. 461. *Vide* Appendix B, Letter No. 3.

[3] Mr. Rangachari remarks tha. the two offices of Mantri and Daḷavāy were amalgamated in the time of Viśvanātha and held by Ariyanātha. In dealing with the Nāyak administrative system, he does not say anything about the latter's holding the office of Pradhāni also (*I.A.*, 1915, p. 113), whereas in another connection he rightly refers to him as the Daḷavāy and Pradhāni. (*Ibid.*, p. 64.)

[4] Bertrand, iv, p. 74; Lockman, i, p. 461. *vide* Appendix B. Letter No. 3.

[5] Bertrand, iii p. 178;

may be explained by the importance of his charge and the necessary absence of the Daḷavāy from headquarters in connection with war and allied questions of foreign policy. The Pradhāni could, therefore, exercise greater power in troublous times, and this occasional stretch of his power many have reacted on his status and influence in ordinary times.

The Rāyasam (Secretary) was next in importance among the ministers. He appears to have figured prominently in the administration. He seems to have been the chief administrative officer, but with less independence than the Daḷavāy and the Pradhāni. As he was in closer touch with the actual administrative machinery on the hand, and came in constant contact with the ruler on the other, he must have exercised much authority. These three officers formed the trio of the King's Council. The other chief officials were the Kaṇakkan (Accountant) and the Sthānāpati (Foreign Secretary). The former was in charge of the Audit department, and the latter was the accredited representative of the King in his dealings with foreign rulers.

Character of the Government.—Though ministerial departments were organized by the Nāyaks, the governmeat was a despotism in name. The King had the power to shape the policy of the kingdom. Though conventions were not without their influence on administration, they had not the binding force of constitutional law. There was nothing to prevent a well-intentioned king from depriving a minister of his charge if he meant to improve its working. Tirumala Nāyaka and Vijayaranga Chokkanātha transferred the *Dēvasthānam* department to themselves. Though there was not much respect for constitutional forms, the requirements of good government were appreciated; and even the most arbitrary exercise of royal authority was tolerated, provided it was for the good of the people. Practically, the King's power was limited by his Council of Ministers, the traditional moral code, and public opinion. Even the powerful Tirumala Nāyaka had to submit to the voice of his people. The Western type of constitutionalism may be said to be foreign to Hindu polity; the spirit of distrust and the hankering after material results, which necessitate an elaborate system of political checks and counterchecks—the chief characteristic of Western political development—were not present in India to the extent they were found in the West in past ages. Religion pervaded the lives of the people and the state; and the moral law was better respected than man-made law. The atmosphere of Hindu states did not encourage the exuberant growth of political organisms of a highly differentiated nature, and could not therefore produce peoples addicted to politics like the Western nations.

Good government was then realized with much less of elaborate political machinery than in modern days. Therefore it is wrong to examine Hindu polity from the point of view of modern political conditions, and praise or condemn it, according as it conforms or not to our administrative arrangements. We have only to find out whether the aims of government were realized. Hindu governments ministered to the material and spiritual needs of the people, while the professed object of modern states is to look after their material interests only. In general, the Nāyaks hardly transcended the limits of the traditional moral and political code; and they had great respect for the general opinion of the people, though they exercised almost absolute powers. As Nelson remarks, 'There were . . . many things which they dared not attempt to do, and there existed a well-defined public opinion which it was never quite safe for them to insult.'[6] The fatal defect of the Nāyak polity, as of Hindu governments in general, was that the welfare of the people depended, to a large extent, on the character of the King, and as an uninterrupted succession of good and able rulers could not be obtained, periods of good government were sometimes followed by intervals of grave misrule. The tendency of Western writers to talk glibly of 'Oriental despotism' and condemn it summarily as 'synonymous with oppresssive rule, is a serious hindrance to the impartial study of old Indian governments. The note of warning sounded by Professor Bury has not been much heeded. Modern writers steeped in Western statecraft do not sufficiently realize that the work of the historian is only to see how far good government was prevalent in past ages, and what machinery was then available for this purpose. The spirit of the administration and its results are better criteria of good government than a highly differentiated mechanism of administration; the form and machihery are only a means to an end.

Provincial Government.—The link between the central government and the local administrations, i.e. the Pāḷaiyams, seems to have been the governors of provinces. These officers were entrusted with much executive authority. Their power seems to have varied considerably with their distance from the capital; a distant provincial ruler had greater freedom from control. It appears that the kingdom was divided into a few large provinces; the governors of Tricoinopoly, Tinnevelly, and Satyamangalam are referred to by the authorities. A letter of 1644 says that the 'governor of Trichinopoly was much more powerful than the Nāyak who then resided at Madura'.[7] The chonicles refer to the high status of, and large powers exercised by,

[6] p. 144.

[7] Bertrand, ii, p.346.

the governor of Tinnevelly.[8] The governors appear to have been under the control of the governor-general or the Daḷavāy. A Jesuit letter of 1653 records that 'the governor-general of Trichinopoly addressed very severe reprimands to the subordinate governor'.[9] John Nieuhoff remarks that the Nāyak of Madura was in possession of 'several considerable countries, each of which is governed by a peculiar governor'; besides the governor-general, who 'has the chief management of the whole kingdom'[10] Below the governors, it appears, there were powerful Polegars, who had some sort of control over the smaller chiefs, and probably it is these who are referred to by the Jesuit writers as the kings of Mānāmadura, Śēndamangalam, Māramangalam, and Salem, and as the seigniors of Dhārāpuram and other places. The Polegar of Kaṇṇivāḍi is spoken of in the chronicles as the chief of the eighteen Polegars of Dindigul.

Local Government.—The unit of administration was the village; several villages were groupnd under a large division called the *mākāṇa*, which was a part of the *nāḍu*. The latter unit seems to have been a component part of the province, which was differently called the *rājya*, *dēśam*, *manḍalam*, or *rāshṭra*. Inscriptions show that provinces were divided into *nāḍu*, *śimai* or *mākāṇa*, and village (variously called *grāmam*, *mangalam*, samudram, *kuḍi*, *ūr*, *puram*, *kuḷam*, *kurichchi*, *paṭṭi*, etc.)[11]. Though the administrative divisions had a variety of names, it is clear that a province consisted of many *nāḍus*, and the latter was composed of many smaller divisions, the smaller unit being the village. Further, the term *nāḍu* was commonly used in all parts of the country. The villages appear to have enjoyed a large measure of local autonomy. John Nieuhoff says that 'each village has two judges, who are much respected by the inhabitants.'[12]

Organization of the Central Government.—The chief officiais of the central government seem to have maintained a subordinate staff to carry on the work of their departments. It appears that they were given a free hand in the appointment and dismissal of their assistants and clerical staff. Thus a spirit of departmental responsibility seems to have prevailed in administration. Nelson says that 'there can be no doubt— that the heads themselves received nothing in the shape

8 Taylor. *O. H. MSS.*, ii, p. 213-5.

9 Bertrand, iii. p. 17.

10 p. 297. *Vide* Appendix C.

11 Appendix D, Nos. 16, 31, 38, 65, 78, 96, 128, 138, 145, 151, 172, 182, 191, 203, 205, 213, 250, and 252.

12 p. 297. *Vide* Appendix C

of salary, but were from time to time rewarded with grants of land and presents of money, when the King thought proper to mark his sense of their services.'[13] The reward given by the King to the officals on special occasions, Nelson takes to be remuneration for their regular services. This seems to be a gratutious assumption. If such a system of irregular payment had prevailed, it could scarcely have escaped the notice of the Jesuit writers, as it would certainly have added force to their condemnation of the Nāyak administrative system.

Justice.—The central government did not maintain an elaborate judicial establishment. Justice was mostly administered locally by the village officers. Arbitration was largely in vogue. Even questions like seniority among brothers, which entailed such consequences as succession to property, etc., were settled by arbitrators.[14] Questions of a general nature, involving social and religious rights, were heard by the King and his officals. The Jesuit letters are full of the complaints which the missionaries carried to the King, who decided them. The Pradhāni seems to have had control over the judicial department. The trial of Proenza recorded by him sheds some light on judicial procedure. His letter of 1665 contains the following observations: The Pradhāni did not consider the rival plaints.... The examination was public . . . He sent for the governor, judges, and all the great personages to come to the place immediately. He came in great pomp . . . . The governor intimidates the witnesses, and compels them to depose according to his wishes . . . . All the procedure was sent to Madura, from where the judgement came soon. It proclaimed my innocense and fined the *ambalakārar* several thousands of *ècus* . . . .'[15] These remarks are sufficient evidence of an organized system of public trials.

Government of the Coasts.—The administration of the coasta regions was in the hands of the Portuguese and the Dutch. The Nāyaks cared only for revenue from their seaports. John Nieuhoff[16] says that about 1664 the seven seaports of Madura were administered by native judges holding office for one year. Each village proposed four persons, of whom two were selected by the Chief Director of the Dutch East India Company; and they swore allegiance to him. Civil

[13] p. 158.

[14] Appendix D. No. 12.

[15] Bertrand, iii, pp. 178-81.

[16] p. 295. *Vide* Appendix C

suits were heard in these village courts, but criminal cases were decided at Tuticorin by the Council of Nine with the Dutch Director as President. While the Portuguese were masters of the coast, they had organized their own system of administration.[17]

2. Finance

Revenue Administration—The administrative system was organized with a view to the collection of revenue with ease and promptitude. The village revenue officer was called the *maṇiyakāran* or *ambalakāran*. The collection from the villages were transmitted to their immediate superior, the head of the *mākāṇam*, and from him in progression to the King's treasury under the control of the Pradhāni. The amount of land tax collected was half of the produce of the land, according to the Jesuit w riter.[18] Nelson takes this as half of the *gross* produce, but it is more reasonable to think that the *net* produce is meant, as taxation in general was on the *net* product. The payment of revenue appears to have been in cash, as the Jesuit authoritie seems to imply.[19] A letter of 1683 says that Ekoji was receiving money payments as revenue. This shows that there was sufficient currency in the country for the sale of paddy. If this was the case in Tanjore, the same system would have been prevalent in Madura. Moreover, as early as the fifteenth century, payment of revenue in cash was adopted by the Vijayanagar emperors. Sufficient details are not available to explain in full the working of the revenue system of the Nāyaks.

Sources of Revenue.—The land tax was the mainstay of the public revenues, as was the case in more ancient times. All the lands were not given to the Polegars. The crown lands, though smaller in extent than all tne Pāḷaikams put together, were more productive, as Nelson thinks. An unfailing source of income seems to have been provided for by the first Nāyak ruler by reserving the best lands for the upkeep of the government. Distant and unproductive lands principally would have been given to the Polegars. Further, the crown lands would have been far better looked after than other portions of the country, as the resources of a government would be far greater, for improvements in land, than those of individuals with limited means. The second chief source of state income consisted of tribute from the Polegars, which amounted to one-third of the produce that they received from their farmers. This income varied

17 *Ibid.*, p. 296.

18 Bertrand, ii, p. 124. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 10.

19 *Ibid.*, iii, p. 338. *Vide Ibid.*, Letter No. 8.

with the circumstances of the times. In the early days of the Nāyakship, the Pāḷaiyams were not very productive. There were numerous obstacles to cultivation, which the Polegars only slowly succeeded in overcoming. In many instances, total remissions of tribute were sanctioned as rewards for public services, as in the cases of the Sētupati, the Polegar of Kaṇṇivāḍi, and others. Regular payment of tribute by the Polegars depended on their temper and the condition of the times. In periods of commotion, it would have been difficult to make them pay; a weak king cannot have received tribute from them in full and with ease. Therefore this was an uncertain source of revenue. The pearl and chank (*Xanxus*) fisheries brought some revenue; but they could not be relied on, as their proceeds varied arbitrarily, and in course of time became very disappointing. Further, only a portion of the coast could bring revenue to the king of Madura, since the Marava king claimed the proceeds from fishing in his roads. The lion's share of the profits went to the Dutch, who bought the pearls and chank at a nominal price. The main sources of income were the three above-mentioned, viz. the land tax, the tribute from Polegars, and the fisheries.

There were numerous miscellaneous taxes which do not seem to have been productive. Inscriptions contain references to these, but the details of their character and incidence are not known. The inscriptions mention *uḷavu* and *paṇḍāravāḍai*,[20] *jōḍi* and *virāḍa*,[21] taxes on looms[22] and weavers,[23] and those on imports and exports.[24] There were also petty taxes on land and water communications, and *octroi* duties. This 'multiple system' of taxation is not economical from the modern standpoint, but it is difficult to appreciate how it reacted on the kingdom at large. It is not enough if particular taxes are selected and their characteristics examined, even if we have sufficient data for such a study. It is more important to appraise the burdens which the tax system, as a whole, imposed on the people, according to their ability to pay. We have no materials for such an ihvestigation. Nelson and Mr. Rangachari, especially the latter, think that all the taxes levied by the Vijayanagar emperors and the Mysore rulers would have been imposed by the Nāyaks on their subject; and therefere they enumerate a long list of them. There is no direct evidence to justify their applicability to Madura. Some of these miscellaneous taxes were frequently made over to temples and

20 Appendix D, No. 37.

21 *Ibid.*, Nos. 75 and 79.

22 *Ibid.*, No. 51.

23 *Ibid.*, Nos. 4 and 100.

24 *Ibid.*, No. 213.

24

public charities. Inscriptions record numerous cases of remission of this kind of taxation. Portions of the crown lands were alienated in favour of private individuals as rewards for meritorious service, and also in favour of temple. State officers and charitable institutions were often granted villages in *sarvamānyam* (free of tax).

Amount of Total Revenue.—Working on the suggestion of Taylor, Nelson[25] gives an estimate of Tirumala Nāyaka's revenues. A *Mackenzie Manuscript* says that 'from the public revenues he (Tirumala) gave one thousand *puns* out of every *lac* (or hundered thousand) for the customary and extraordinary services and festivals of the god; for the regular fulfilment of this gift, he endowed the temple with lands to the annual value of forty-four thousand *puns*.' Hence Taylor's remark—'whence it is to be presumed that his whole revenue amounted to forty-four *lacs* of gold *puns*.'[26] The *Maduraittalavaralāṟu* records that Tirumala gave 'forty-four thousand *pons*-producing lands to Gods Sundarēśvara and Mīnākshi'. This statement of the chronicles can hardly be taken as a precise record of facts. However, it affords the working basis for a rough estimate.

There are indications about the total amount of the Nāyak revenue in the writings of the Jesuit Vico and Barradas. The former says in a letter of 30th August, 1611. 'The great Nāyak of Madura and those of Tanjore and Gingi are themselves tributaries of Bisnagar, to whom they pay, or have to pay, each an annual tribute of six to ten million.'[27] As the tribute was usually one-third of the revenue, the total income of the Nāyaks was between eighteen and and thirty million *francs*, according to Vico. Barradas records in 1616: 'The Great Naique of Madura . . . . . pays a revenue every year of, some say, six hundred thousand pagodas.'[28] This puts the Nāyak revenue at eigteen lakhs of *pagoḍas*. A Jesuit writer equates fourteen *pagoḍas* to nearly eighty *francs*;[29] and a *franc* is equal to 9.6 pence. Therefore, eighteen lakhs of *pagoḍas* are equal to £411, 428$\frac{4}{7}$; eighteen million *francs* to £ 720,000; thirty million *francs* to £ 1,200,000. Wilks equates the *pagoḍa* differently; according to him, five thousand *pagoḍas* are equal to £ 1,840,[30] and therefore, eighteen lakhs of *pagoḍas* come to £662,400. If the value ascribed to the *pagoḍa* by Wilks be correct, then the amount given by Barradas approaches Vico's lower estimate of eighteen million *francs*. Forty-

25 pp. 156-6.

26 Taylor, *O.H. MSS.*, ii, pp. 147-9:

27 Bertrand, ii, p. 124. *Vide* Appendix A, Letter No. 10.

28 R. Sewell. *A Forgotten Empire*, p. 230.

29 Bertrand, iii, p. 366.

30 I. p. 23.

four lakhs of *pons* are equal to £880,000, according to Nelson, and to £825,000, according to Mr. Rangachari. The latter takes the value of the *pon* to be half a *pagoḍa*. In that case, the estimate of the chronicles comes to twenty-two lakhs of *pagoḍas*, and therefore four lakhs higher than that of Barradas.

Nelson is disposed to take the higher estimate of Vico, i.e. thirty million *francs*, and equate them to £1,200,000. He tries to reconcile the statement of the chronicles with this. It appears that, since forty-four lakhs of *pons* come only to £880,000, he thinks that the chronicles give, not the total revenue, but the land revenue alone. Therefore, he adds to this the amounts of the tribute and miscellaneous income; he puts them at £189,000 and £131,000 respectively. The total of these figures comes to £1,200,000. Nelson's method of arriving at this precise result is arbitrary and artificial. He appears to have been obsessed by the statement of the Jesuit writer, and to have manipulated the amounts of the various sources of revenue, so that they might agree with Vico's higher estimate. Nelson does not seem to have had sufficient justification for choosing the higher amount given by Vico; he remarks that 'assuming, as we may well assume, that he of Madura paid the largest sum...'[81] Though Madura was more extensive than Tanjore and Gingi, she does not appear to have been more wealthy; the land was unproductive and covered with forests. A large part of Madura was brought under cultivation in the course of the Nāyak regime. Wild beasts and robbers offered great impediments to agricultural progress. Therefore Nelson's assumption remains to be proved. The statement of Barradas was not available for him. The greatest error in his estimate is his supposition that the forty-four lakhs of *pons*, given by the chronicles, represent the land revenue, not the total revenue. Their statement has already been quoted; it refers only to the total revenue But Nelson says that 'the lands granted must have been crown lands, under the King's own management and altogether at his disposal, or they could not have been granted; and if, therefore, the revenue. yielded by them amounted, as stated, to one *per cent* on the *total revenues derived from the King's lands*, the inference is that the lands intended were the crown lands, and that they yielded no less than 44,00,000 *pons* or £880,000 *per annum*'. Tirumala set apart crown lands producing an annual revenue of forty-four thousand *pons*, but this only means that he calculated approximately what one per cent of his *total revenues* would amount to, and gave the lands necessary to yield that amount. Because he gave a portion of the crown lands, it cannot be contended that the total revenues of those lands are

[81] p. 155.

referred to. The explicit statement of the chronicles that Tirumala made the gift from 'the public revenues' is sufficient ground for rejecting the inference drawn by Nelson.

Tirumala's revenues cannot have been so large as £1,200,000, as Nelson estimates them. A more coerect estimate would be to put them at about seven lakhs of pounds; this will be in conformity with the evidence of Barradas, Vico, and the chronicles. This amount would have been the revenue budgeted, not the income realized, as remission of taxation and alienation of crown lands were frequent; and these could not have well been provided for. Moreover, there were many uncertain sources of income.

Nelson proceeds further in his investigation, and says that 'Tirumala's gross revenue of £1,200,000 was equivalent to revenue of nearly fifty millions of pounds drawn at the the present time (in 1868)'; because, 'the value of money has risen more than fortyfold'.[32] He compares the price of rice in 1713 with that during 1863-6, and says that it increased fortyfold in the course of that century and a half. The following remarks from Martin's letter of 1713 have been utilized by Nelson for arriving at the conclusion just referred to: 'One *fanom* (*paṇom*) will procure up to eight *maraikkāls*, or large measures, of very fine husked rice, whice is sufficient to feed a man for more than fifteen days. But, when there is lack of rains, it becomes so dear that I have seen the price of one of these measures of rice mount up to four *fanoms*.'[33] Nelson says that eight *maraikkāls* would weigh about ninety-sixpounds, and they could be had for a *fanom* or 2¼ pence. 'Now in 1886 and the two or three years preceding it, the average price of good rice was about twenty pounds for a Rupee. Consequently, whereas a penny bought some forty odd pounds of good rice at the commencement of the eighfeen century, it has been an equivalent for only five-sixths of a pound during the last few years.'[34] Thus Nelson arrives at the astounding conclusion that the price of commodities has risen more than forty times. But his data are open to question. The Jesuit writer quoted above speaks of the condition of things in the Marava country. He says that there were great oscillations in the price of rice, sometimes to the extent of a rise of thirty-two times. Nelson takes the lowest rate he gives. Moreover, Martin says that 'nowhere are such precautions taken as in Marava not to let out a dro of water, and gather all that of the streams and torrents, which the rains bring'. He greatly

[32] p. 156.

[33] Bertrand, iv, pp. 194-5. *Vide* Appendix A, Lettter No. 12

[34] Nelson, pp. 155-6.

admires the wonderful irrigation facilities of the Marava country.[35] These modifying conditions have been overlooked by Nelson, who takes only the minimum price of rice, and applies it to Madura. Moreover, he is not right in equating the *fanom* to 2¼ pence. Léon Besse[36] remarks that the *fanom* is a gold coin worth 120 *reis* (*Or. Conq.*), i.e. about fifty *centimes*. Therefore, a *fanom* is to be taken as equal to 4·8 pence, i.e. more than twice the value attached to it by Nelson. Dewan Bahadur Srinivasa Raghavaiyangar[37] says, with reference to the letter of Martin quoted above, that only forty-five pounds of rice are required for a man for fifteen days, and that therefore, taking Nelson's equation of a *fanom* to 2½pence, the price in 1713 would be only one-twelfth of what it was in 1893, that is, the increase in price would be only twelvefold. When the *fanom* is correctly equated to 4.8 pence, the rise would be not more than six times, not forty times, as Nelson contends. This is confirmed by Dr. Vincent A. Smith's remark[38] that Akbar's revenue of forty million pounds would amount to two hundred million pounds at the present time ; the rise in price is, therefore, estimated as fivefold.

Expenditure.—The ordinary expenditure of the Nāyaks was not in proportion to their income. Regular payments from the treasury were few, and they did not amount to much. Some officials seem to have been paid. The army cannot have required large sums for its upkeep, since the Polegars were bound to supply the number of troops fixed by the original agreement with them. Occasionally professional soliders and mercenaries were employed and paid. The administration was not highly organized, and it was conducted mostly on traditional lines. The ordinary expenses of government, as the salaries of officials, the army, the police and judicial departments, did not constitute a serious drain on the public revenues.

The chief items of expenditure seem to have been Public Works and Charities, besides those mentioned above. Large expenditure on temples, for their construction and maintenance, was essential, as the state had to look after the spiritual interests of its subjects. This could not be avoided by a Hindu king if he wanted to gain popular support. Similarly the maintenance of public charity was deemed an nssential function of the state, which was expected to set an example of the ideal of individual action, according to the Sacred Books. Irrigation works consumed a large part of the government

35 Bertrand, iv, p. 195.

36 *La Mission du Madurē*, p. 368*n*.

37 *Memorandum on the Progress of the Madras Presidency*, p. 7 *n*.

38 *Akbar the Great Mogul*, p. 148.

balances. Thus, though there was not much regular expenditure, non-recurring expenses of a heavy character were a marked feature of the Nāyak finances. Every year there was a huge surplus, which went on accumulating, and from these hoarded balances expenditure on a large scale was met. These surpluses were evidently intended to make provision for war and bad times, and for elaborate works to promote the material and spiritual welfare of the people. The chief characteristic of a modern budget could not be safely aimed at in the past ages. The mark of a financier in our time is to work out a budget which leaves neither a surplus nor a deficit; if he budgets surpluses or deficits, he is condemned as lacking in foresight and of poor abilities. Nowadays the financial world is so developed that it is possible to meet extraordinary and unexpected expenditure, without leaving a margin for it in the budget. But, in olden times, hoarding of the precious metals was the chief means of making provision for unforeseen expenses. Therefore, the Nāyaks are not to blame for regularly accumulating surpluses. Funds in excess of the ordinary needs were invariably spent in the country and for its welfare.

The Jesuit estimate of the Nāyak financial system amounts to an unqualified condemnation. The extracts translated in Appendix A represent the Nāyaks in the worst light possible. Oppression, which reduced the people to indigence, is said to have been customary. From a persual of the accounts referred to, and even on the assumption they are trustworthy, it is hard to believe that a kingdom, based on the worst form of tyranny and injustice, was able to hold its own against its enemies even for a short time, and that it was able to make any contribution to the progress of the country. The exaggerated pictures of the Jesuits fail to convince us, and they plainly betray intentional misreading and manipulation of facts. The services rendered to the country by the Nāyaks—to be explained below—constitute a direct refutation of their charges. Hindu opinion is strongly sensitive to bad rule; and the Nāyaks are generally praised in chronicles written long after their extinction. However, it has to be admitted that there were periods of oppressive rule and grave maladministration, which weakened the resources of the kingdom and led to its collapse. But, even according to the Jesuit writers, the Nāyaks of Madura were far better rulers than those of Tanjore and Gingi and their Mahratta and Muhammadan successors. They were, therefore, far ahead of their contemporaries. The Muhammadan rule which immediately fellowed the Nāyak regime in Madura was far worse. Bishop Caldwell[39] quotes contemporary records to

39 *History of Tinnevelly*, pp. 107 8.

show that intolerable oppression was normal in the times of the 'Renter'. A. J. Stuart[40] says that the Nāyak land assessment was light in comparison with that of the Nawabs of the Carnatic. As rulers, therefore, the Nāyaks occupy a distinctly high position among their South Indian contemporaries, and were far superior to their immediate successor. It is unfair to them to compare their systems of administration and finance with those of Madura at the present day; chiefly because modern ideas are the product of world-wide changes of a peculiar nature, and cannot be the criterion of the achievements of the past. Moreover, the features of the British system, which ultimately supplanted that of the Nāyaks, are too near to us to lend themselves to impartial historical treatment.

3. Social life

Peace and Order.—Though much was done by the Nāyaks to establish a strong government and curb the disorderly forces in the kingdom, the misdeeds of the rude Polegars and predatory hordes were only mitigated. During the latter days of the Nāyak rule and in troublous times, people suffered from the caprices of their local rulers. Besides these human agencies, famine, pestilence, and inundations introduced an element of insecurity in social life. These devasting forces were not fully harnessed, and occasionally they were too strong to be controlled by human agencies. Though most of the forests were cleared—and large tracts of the country made habitable, and improved so as to contribute to the resources of agriculture—those that remained constituted, to some extent, a peril to life and property; for they harboured wild beasts and robbers. These pests were not completely destroyed. An inscription of Tirumala Nāyaka[41] records a grant as reward for slaying tigers. A Jesuit letter of 1662[42] refers to the roaming about of wolves, bears, and tigers in the immediate neighbourhood of Madura. Subsequent letters also contain references to the fear which people had of them. Hence travelling and rapid communication were not quite safe and easy.

Commerce and Industries.—The Nāyaks did not give sufficient encouragement to commerce; their naval deficiency was a hindrance to foreign trade; and it even shaped their attitude towards, and lowered them in the estimation of, the Portuguese and the Dutch. The people had only a few wants, which were mostly supplied by the country. There was some active internal trade in and around the capital carried on by Hindus; but foreign trade was chiefly in other

40 *Manual of Tinnevelly*, p. 70.

41 Appendix D, No. 145.

42 *Ante*, p. 117.

hands. Father Martin remarks in his letter of 30th January, 1699, that 'the Madurans spend their lives with the utmost sobriety and frugality, they not concerning themselves with traffic, but are contented with the food and raiment which their native country supplies them with.'[43] What little was required from foreign countries was bought from the Portuguese and the Dutch. Japan leather and spices from the Moluccas were exchanged for Madura linens.[44] The principal trade in pearls and chank was carried on exclusively by the Europeans. It is said that a Portuguese agent came to Tuticorin to purchase saltpetre in exchange for elephants.[45] The existence of export and import duties noticed above, as recorded in inscriptions shows that there was foreign trade; but from the other authorties, it is clear that it was limited, and was not conducted by the people of the land, who were mainly concerned with internal trade. The exports referred to indicate that there was some manufacturing activity in Madura, chiefly connected with cloth.[46] The Nāyaks fostered this industry, which has survived with redoubled vigour to our time. The want of a navy greatly restricted the foreign trade and industries of Madura. Most of the article needed for consumption in the country were locally produced, and only a few luxuries were importrd.

Religious Life.—The Nāyaks only continued the the traditions of Hindu rule in following a policy of religious toleration They even actively supported religions other than their own, though not to the same extent. Their attitude towards Christianity has already been discussed. Forgetting the excesses committed by the Muhammadans during their rule in Madura before the Vijayanagar conquest of the south, they made grants to mosques and private Muhammadan individuals. That a usurpation like that of Rustam Khan was possible is proof positive of the favour shown to the Muhammadans by the Nāyaks. It is not likely that there was a large Muhammadan population in Madura, though the statement of a Muhmmadan writer, that about 1628 there was 'not a single Musalman' in the country, can hardly be accepted.[47] With regard to the different sects of Hinduism, the Nāyaks were equally tolerant. Minor distinctions in creed do not seem to have affected them in dealing with their subjects. An inscription of 1731[48] records a grant to a servant of the

[43] Bertrand, iv, p. 13; Lockman, i, p. 5.
[44] Bertrand, iv. p. 44; Lockman, i, p. 381. *Vide* Appendix B, Letter No. 2.
[45] Danvers, *Report*, p. 53.
[46] Nieuhoff mentions calico-painting and refers to the high perfection that it had reached (p. 295. *Vide* Appendix C).
[47] Sir H. Elliot, *History of India*, vii, p. 139.
[48] Appendix D, No. 234.

Tinnevelly Śiva temple for the maintenance of worship, but the deed is ornamented with Vaishṇava figures. Though there were petty disputes among the various sects, they were not serious enough to disturb their harmonious social relations and co-operation for common ends. Religion was actively fosterd by the Nāyaks, who strongly believed that it was the duty of the state to safeguard and further the spiritual and moral welfare of the people.

Social Institutions.—The traditional structure of society was not disturbed by the Nāyaks. The Brahman enjoyed special privileges, and was higly venerated. His services were utilized for the welfare of the state; his counsel was eagerly sought for and acted upon. His time-honoured prestige did not suffer in the least. Generally the Nāyaks were very conservative in social policy. The caste system was considered sacrosanct, and there were occasions of royal interferente to check breaches of its rules. Inscriptions of 1623[49] record the king's orders prohibiting 'the five sub-divisions of the *Kammāḷar* (artisan caste) from communal fellowship,' i.e. that they should not intermingle with each other. Mangammāḷ is said to have granted a *cadjan śāsanam* in 1705 authorizing the Paṭṭunūlkārans of Madura to follow the rites prescribed for the Brahmans in regard to *Upākarma* (the ceremony of the renewal of the Sacred Thread). She convened a conference of her Pundits, and follewed their advice.[50] Social legislation was undertaken by the Nāyaks when necessary, and they did not diverge much from the old order of things, though Mangammāḷ's decision above referred to savours a little of modern 'Social Reform'. Vijayaranga Chokkanātha felt insulted at the Ceylon embassy which carried a proposal for marriage, because of caste considerations. The social institutions that call for passing notice here are the *harem* and the *sati*. These seem to have been confirmed mostly to kings and nobles. John Nieuhoff[51] remarks that concubinage was prevalent among the people, chiefly the officials and the rich. The institution of the royal *harem* appears to have been largely due to Muhammadan influence, though it was not absent in ancient times. The Jesuit writers say that Tirumala Nāyaka had 200 wives in his *harem*, and the *Kiḷavan* Sētupati about forty-seven. All of them are said to have committed *sati* on the death of these respective rulers. A Muhammadan traveller refers in 1628 to the 700 wives of the ruler of Madura, who followed him on his funeral-pyre.[52] Foreign observers unfailingly make remarks on this institution of self-immolation. It

[49] Appendix D, Nos. 124 and 125.

[50] *Census of India*, 1901, xv, Madras, Part i, p. 173.

[51] pp. 295 and 297. *Vide* Appendiv C.

[52] Sir H. Elliot, *History of India*, vii, p. 139.

is clear from their writings that this custom was in vogue in South India.

Education.—Robert de Nobili's letter of 22nd November, 1610, throws some light on the educational organization of the Nāyaks: 'In Madura there are more than 10,000 students, distributed in different classes of two to three hundred...; these students are all Brahmans, for only they have the right to apply themselves to the study of the higher sciences...In order that the students may not be distracted by the necessity of providing for their maintenance, Bisnagar and the great Nāyak have made splendid foundations, whose revenues are sufficient for the remuneration of the masters and the subsistence of all the students.'[53] In their educational policy, therefore, the Nāyaks followed the ancient Hindu system of combining religious and scientific studies, and restricting them to the Brahmans. There appears to be very little of originality in their scheme. The chief characteristic of the Hindu educational system was that much was left to home influences and local organizations; only the higher studies were organized and provided for by the state. Besides Sanskrit, Tamil and Telugu were encouraged by the Nāyaks. Inscriptions show that they did not neglect any of these languages. Mr. H. Krishna Sastri says that 'of the Madura Nāyaks, Tirumala, Muddalagādri and Vijayaranga Chokkanātha were patrons of Telugu Literature.'[54] The Nāyaks made liberal grants to *maṭhas* (religious houses or monasteries) and temples where education was imparted free. Their buildings, irrigation works, and epigraphical records show that the people had a high level of intelligence and education.

4. CONCLUSION

The destinies of a large part of South India were in the hands of the Nāyaks for about two centuries. The integrity of their kingdom was preserved down to the time of Tirumala Nāyaka. The weakness of his successor reduced the extent of the Nāyak dominions. Mangammāḷ could not completely restrain the disintegrating forces already set in motion. For a long time Madura was well governed, —far above the standards of the age; Tanjore and Gingi envied her position. The present condition of the southern districts was largely shaped by the Nāyaks. By the denudation of forests and encouragement of agriculture, they increased the resources of the kingdom. They spared no pains in improving the irrigation facilities. By granting *agrahāras* in charity and building temples, they gave a strong

[53] Bertrand, ii, p. 90,

[54] *Archaeological Survey of India, Report,* 1911-2, p. 195.

stimulus to habitation, and the population increased appreciably. Beautiful towns and numerous villages sprang up in places previously occupied by wild beasts and haunted by robbers. Inaccessible regions were explored by the Polegars, and the country was reclaimed to civilized ways. Especially the present town of Madura is mostly what the Nāyaks made it to be. By diverting the surplus revenues of the kingdom frequently to the fruitful channels above indicated, and to the construction of magnificent *pagoḍas* and other buildings, they revived some of the essential features of Hindu culture. The Kingdom became a suitable abode for the Hindus, principally through their exertions. The opinion that these public works were undertaken with forced labour is too hollow to be seriously maintained. That a line of Hindu kings, with deep veneration for the traditions of their past and the ideals of their ancestors, and with plently of resources, committed the most unpardonable crime of defrauding highly-skilled workmen of the fruits of their labour in the construction of works, which are essentially an expression of the heart, is beyond belief. Ruskin's philosophical deduction from an elaborate and critical study of ancient and medieval architecture cannot be lost sight of. Oppression and tyranny can hardly be a source of inspiration to artistic magnificence and permanency. A tyrannical age, screaming with the pangs of unjust and unnecessary sufferings, can scarcely give birth to wonderful productions of artistic genius.

The services rendered by the Nāyaks to Hindu religion and culture in weathering the storm of Christian missionary propaganda, without resorting to an organized policy of persecution, are not sufficiently appreciated. But for their unremitting care for, and love of, Hinduism and for the bold fight they put up in defence of their national ideals, the cause of the age-long curilization might have been jeopardised. They saved the country from the deluge of a foreign religious conquest, and from the dangers, social and political, attending on it. As has been remarked before, they acquitted themselves far better than their contemporary rulers and their immediate successors in this respect also.

The Nāyaks and their administrative system were not without grave drawbacks. Kings and statesmen of superior ability among them can be easily named. With the exception of Viśvanātha, the founder of the dynasty, Tirumala Nāyaka, and Mangammāḷ and among ministers, of Ariyanātha, Rāmappaiya, and Narasappaiya, most of the Nāyaks and their advisers were mediocrities and imbeciles. Some of them gloried in their love of pomp and extravagance. The resources of the kingdom were at times drained to afford pleasure to their fancies. The Nāyaks, in general, lacked original ideas

of administration. They were wanting in intelligence of a high order and adaptability. Singularly defective in initiative, they moved the ship of state in the old channel, unmindful of the gathering storms and the appearance of new and dangerous shoals. The central government was too weak to be effective in times of danger. The Polegar System survived its use, and accelerated the centrifugal tendenices. Along with its degeneracy the military equipment of the country, which it provided, became effete. The armies of the Polegars were without unity, and they frequently quarrelled among themselves. Their disloyalty increased, and their co-operation for the common cause became difficult. The employment of mercenaries was not a source of strength to the military organization. Such an army could not be a match for the troops of the Sētupati, as was explained before. It was even less a match for foreign enemies.

The Nāyaks, like most Hindu rulers, paid little attention to the navy. Hence the resources of the kingdom could not develop through trade and commerce. The naval strength of the Portuguese and the Dutch made them powers to reckon with. They enriched themselves at the expense of the Nāyaks, who had to remain idle spectators of their rivalry and progress, and sometimes tolerate their misdeeds.

To these defects were added the exhausting struggles due to disagreement about succession to the throne. The following remarks of Wilks[55] are to the apoint: 'The Hindoo system of policy, jurisprudence and religion, affects still more strongly than any European Code the right of hereditary succession; but the sons are all co-heirs: and the faint distinction in favour of the eldest son is limited by the express condition, that he shall be worthy of the charge; but unhappily there is nothiug so difficult to determine as the relative worth of opposing claimants; and in the pretensions to royalty, the double question of divine favour and superior merit must, in spite of reason, be decided by the sword.' Kasūtri Rangaiya's usurpation culminated in his murder. On the death of Tirumala Nāyaka, the situation was pregnant with danger; but, fortunately, it was set right. The last occasion when this defective law of succession exhibited all its potency for evil was on the death of Vijayaranga Chokkanātha. The struggle which ensued after this event weakened the kingdom and gave room for foreign interference. Though succession disputes did not endanger the Nāyak state frequently, they had their share in leading it to its final fate. The extinction of the Nāyak

[55] I, p. 17.

kingdom was due to all this internal weakness, which was rapidly accumulating at a time when the Muhammadans were attempting to penetrate into it, and when Mysore was well organized and strong, and therefore naturally disposed to take advantage of the impotence of her neighbour.

Nelson says that the extinction of the Nāyak dynasty was 'undoubtedly a great blessing for Madura'; because, it was 'opposed to all improvement . . . and rendered true happiness an impossibility to all classes, rich and poor, noble and degraded.'[56] Though this remark can, to some extent, be applied to the Nāyak rule in its last days, it shows an inadequate appreciation of the services of the Nāyaks in general. It is true in the sense that 'the old order changeth, yielding place to new'. Bishop Caldwell's trenchant remarks exhibit utter lack of sympathy; his opinion is that the Nāyak rule was only 'misrule hidden by shows'.[57] The impartial verdict of A.J. Stuart is worth recording as a fitting epilogue to the history of the Nāyaks of Madura: 'A government whose wealth and whose tastes are manifested by the temples and statues of Tinnevelly, and whose readiness to employ all its resources for the benefit of its people, as proved by the number and nature of irrigation works which it completed, implies a contented and prosperous people; while a high state of the arts and of knowledge is abundantly testified by the exquisite design and workmanship discoverable in many of the temples and statues, as well as by the grasp and mastery of the principles of irrigation, a complicated and difficult branch of the engineering art displayed in their irrigation system.'[58]

56 p. 176.
57 *History of Tinnevelly*, pp. 62-3.
58 *Manual of Tinnevely*, p. 69.

APPENDIX A[1]

LA MISSION DU MADURÉ III

By

FATHER J. BERTRAND OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS,
MISSIONARY OF MADURA

(1) *Letter of Proenza to Nikel, Trichinopoly, 1659.*

(**P. 41**) Having to narrate to you the adversities which have afflicted our mision during these three years, I feel bound to bring to your notice at first the political revolutions which have caused them.

Political Events.—From time immemorial this was the political condition of India. From Cape Comorin, all the part (of the country) to the east of the the ridge of the Ghats was under the three Nāyaks, of Madura, Tanjore, and Gingi, tributaries (**P. 42**) of Narasinga[2] (Narasimha) of Bisnagar (Vijayanagar). Mysore, situated to the west of Gingi, had long ago withdrawn herself from subordination to the same monarch. To the north of these states and of Bisnagar were the kingdom of Golkonda to the east, and that of the Dakhan to the west, which (the latter) was also called the kingdom of Bijapur or Visapur, from the name of its capital. These two kingdoms, once so powerful, are now no more than *subahs* of the Great Moghul, whose capital is Delhi. Bisnagar itself, driven to the south by this powerful enemy, has been obliged to fix its seat at Vellore until the Muhammadan domination covers up the whole of India. The ancient kings of the country seem to invite this conquest by their jealousies and follies, as we are going to see.

[1] My translation of the letters in this Appendix was revised by the Rev. J. Bourdot, S.J., Professor of French, St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly, through the kindness of the Rev. P. Carty, S.J., of the same college. A literal translation has been attempted as far as possible.

[2] The kingdom of Vijayanagar was so called by the Portuguese and other foreigners, perhaps after the name of the great emperor Sāḷuva Narasimha or Narasinga.

The Nāyaks of Madura had been punctual, for a long time in paying the annual tribute; but, their arrogance growing with their strength, they began to feel this subordination irksome. Tirumala Nāyaka, who rules now, walking in the footsteps of his father, resolved to free himseif. Too weak to resist his sovereign openly, he resorted to artifice. During several years he gave only rich presents, as marks of deference and friendships, without paying his tribute. The old Narasinga dissembled, to avoid the embarrassments of a war. But, after his death, the new king, far superior to his father in talents and courage, hastened to vindicate his right; without losing time in futile negotiations, he collected a formidable army (**P. 43**) and declared war. The Nāyak of Madura enlisted in his defection those of Tanjore and Gingi, by concluding with them a league against their common sovereign. The latter, informed of everything through the Nāyak of Tanjore, who had the meanness to betray his allies, marched at the head of his army and advanced on the territory of Gingi. Swayed only by fury and desire for vengeance, Tirumala Nāyaka secretly addressed the *subah* of Golkonda, and requested it to invade the kingdom of Vellore. The Muhammadan did not require more; at once he entered this opulent kingdom and delivered it to devastation. Narasinga obliged to suspend his march, turned round and attacked his enemy, who was repulsed with loss.

The king of Golkonda, resolved to vindicate his honour, raised an army more numerous than before, resumed the field, regained his vantage-ground, and actively attacked Narasinga. The latter finding no chance of success but in an alliance with the three Nāyaks, invited them to join him against the common enemy and offered them favourable conditions, which were accepted. Pleased with their good disposition, he joined them to better concert together the means of defence and attack. But here the Indian character was revealed: Narasinga spent more than a year with three Nayaks in the midst of festivities, feasts, and pleasures, during which the Muhammadans quietly achieved the conquest of his dominions. Soon vain joys gave place to jealousies and divisions. Rejected again by the Nāyaks, Narasinga established his court in the forests of Thieves (Kaḷḷans), lying to the north of Tanjore, where he spent four months, a prey to all discomforts; his courtiers soon abandoned him, and this grand monarch (**P. 44**), one of the richest in India, was forced to beg for help from the king of Mysore, once the vassal of his crown. He received from him invitation to choose, for his stay, a province more agreeable to him, and assurance of a brilliant treatment worthy of his rank; he eagerly accepted the offer, so obliging, and found a hospitality, which even surpassed the promises made to his ambassadors.

. . . A detachment of the Moghul cavalry sent to pursue Narasinga came to the environs of Tanjore. It created a panic in the citadel. . . .

(p.45) . . . The Golkonda army, resolved to add to the conquest of Narasinga's dominions that of the kingdoms of his tributaries, advanced on the territory of Gingi. The Nāyak of Tanjore knew that he could not give pitched battle to an enemy, whose mere number had created so much terror; but, he could not longer count on his ally of Madura, whom he had scandalously betrayed. Obliged to take sides, he did what one would always do, under the influence of terror; he decided on the most senseless and disastrous step: he delivered himself up to the king of Golkonda and concluded with him a treaty by which he surrendered at discretion.

Tirumala Nāyaka, seeking safety in his unsound (p.46) policy, committed a second folly, which brought about the ruin of all these kingdoms. His ambassadors went, in his name, to treat with Idal Khan (the Adil Shah) or the king of the Dakhan, who sent him seventeen thousand horses. With this imposing cavalry and thirty thousand infantry of his own, he marched to Gingi. But the Muhammadans of the two armies easily came to an understanding among themselves. The *subah* of Golkonda concluded a treaty with the general of Idal Khan, and retired to the kingdom of Bisnagar to consolidate its conquest; while the seventeen thousand cavalry of Idal Khan, along with some regiments of infantry, continued the siege of Gingi, which they were called for to defend. The thirty thousand Madura infanty entered into the palace and joined the troops of the king of Gingi. The fortress, protected by its advantageous position, was, besides, defended by good fortifications, furnished with a strong artillery and by a numerous army, provisioned for a considerable time; it could, accordingly, defy all efforts of the besiegers. But soon disagreements and divisions sprang up among these men (the besieged) so diversified in nationality and manners. A revolt broke out; in the midst of the general confusion, the gates of the citadel were thrown open to the enemy, who rushed into it and delivered the town, the richest in all these countries, to pillage. The booty was immense, consisting of silver, gold, pearls, and precious stones of inestimable value.

Masters of Gingi, the Muhammadans marched against the Nāyaks of Tanjore and Madura. The former hid himself in inaccessible forests; the latter shut himself up in his fortress of Madura, whose distance appeared to screen him from the enemy. But when they saw him overrunning their dominions and carrying devastation

everywhere, they opened negotiations and submitted to the law of the (P.47) conqueror. Thus, after conquering a vast country, subduing two powerful kings, and gathering incalculable treasures, without being put to the necessity of giving a single battle, and almost without losing a single solidier, the Dakhan army returned to Bijapur, where it made a triumphal entry.

Delivered from this formidable adversary, the two Nāyaks should have felt bound, it would appear, to heal the wounds of this disastrous war, and strengthen themselves against fresh attacks, which they ought to expect, more especially as they had not the intention to fulfil the treaties. But this was the least of their cares. They only thought of oppressing their own subjects, whom their (Nāyaks') imprudence and cowardice had already delivered to the horrors of an invasion by the enemy. Their arrogance seemed to conceal the degradation and meanness which had dishonoured them, in rivetting the yoke of their despotism on their people. Extortions and spoliations recommenced with a cruelty which made them universally regret the domination of the Moghuls.

Narasinga had more wisdom; encouraged by the good reception and help of the king of Mysore, he took advantage of the absence of Kanakan (Khan-i-Khanan), Idal Khan's general, to recover his kingdom. Accordingly, with an army of Mysoreans, he entered the field, reconquered a part of his provinces, and repulsed the army of Golkonda, which advanced to attack him. It appears certain that if then the three Nāyaks had joined him with all the troops they could gather, they would easily have succeeded in chasing the common enemy, and depriving him of the advantage he had taken of their disunion and reciprocal betrayal. But Providence, which wanted to punish them, left them to this spirit of folly, which precipitated the ruin of princes and (their) dominions.

(P. 48) Tirumala Nāyaka, instead of co-operating in the re-establishment of the affairs of Narasinga, who alone could save the country, recommenced negotiations with the Muhammadans, opened to them again the passage through the Ghats, and urged them to declare war against the king of Mysore, whom he should have sought for help. (The king of) Bisnagar, betrayed a second time by his vassal, succumbed to the contest, and was obliged to seek refuge, on the confines of his kingdom, in the forests where he led a miserable life . . , prince (made) unhappy by the folly of his vassals, whom his personal qualities rendered worthy of a better fate. Kanakan did not wish to leave the country without levying ransom on Tanjore and Madura; he raised large contributions and returned to Bijapur full of riches.

His departure was the occasion for a new war, more furious than the previous ones. The king of Mysore took Tirumala Nāyaka to task for his disloyal conduct. To wreak just vengeance and compensate himself for the cost of the war, he despatched an army to seize the province of Satyamangalam which borders on his kingdom. The general entrusted with this expedition did not experience any resistance, and made himself master of the capital, where he found considerable booty. Encouraged by the facility of the conquest, he exceeded the orders of his king and advanced to the walls of Madura without coming across the enemy. His unexpected arrival threw the Nāyak into such a consternation that, neglecting the means of defence in his hands, he was inclined to run away, without any following, and hide himself in the woods. It would have been all over with Madura but for the unexpected help of the Maravas. This warlike people, well known for the wars that they had conducted more than once with advantage against the Europeans of the sea-coast, gave their name to (the country) Marava, situated between Madura and the (P. 49) sea. The king of the Maravas, informed of the danger that threatened the Nāyak whose vassal he is, collected twenty-five thousand men in one day, marched at their head, and placed himself between the walls of the town and the army of besiegers. A help so opportune emboldened the Nāyak, who, on his part, raised an army of thirty-five thousand men, and thus found himself superior in number to his enemy.

The Mysore general, too weak to hazard a general action and informed of the approaching arrival of reinforcements, which his king had sent him, temporised and, by his presents, won the Brahman commander of the Madura forces. The traitor sought to repress the ardour of his soldiers and put off, from day to day, the time of attack. But the Maravas, impatient at this delay, conceived suspicions. cried treason, threw the Brahman into a dungeon, pounced on the enemies, and cut them to pieces. The remains of the defeated army took refuge in a neighbouring fortress, where, after some days, the expected reinforcements of twenty thousand men joined them. The combat again began with such fury that each army left nearly twelve thousand dead on the battlefield.

The advantage remained with the Nāyak, who utilized his superiority to return to the Mysoreans the evils which they has inflicted on his kingdom, and transport the theatre of this bloody war to their provinces. A special circumstance :characterised its ferocity. The king of Mysore had ordered to cut off the nose of all the prisoners; his soldiers, to distinguish themselves, executed this barbarous order on all toose who fell into their hands, men, women, and

children, and sent to Mysore sacks full of noses, as so many glorious trophies. The Nāyak, resenting this procedure, which, in the opinion of the Indians, added the most humiliating outrage to cruelty, ordered (**P. 50**) reprisals; and his troops burst out into the provinces of Mysore, seeking not enemies to fight, but noses to cut. It is this which has given to this inhuman war the name of 'hunt for noses'. The king of Mysore, the first contriver of this barbarity, himself lost his own nose, and thus suffered the penalty which we deserved.

Tirumala Nāyaka had not the time to enjoy this victory; he was called to answer before God for the evils which his treacherous policy had brought on his people and neighbouring kingdoms. He died at the age of seventy-five after a reign of thirty years. One cannot refuse him great qualities; but he tarnished their glory towards the end of his life by vices and follies, which nothing can justify. His reign was rendered illustrious by works of magnificence, truly royal; among these are the *pagoḍa* of Madura, some public buildings and, the king's palace, whose colossal proportions and wonderful boldness recall and ancient monuments of Thebes. He loved and protected the Christian religion, whose excellence he recognized: but he never had the courage to accepted the consequences of his conviction. The greatest obstacle to his conversion came from his two hundred wives, the most distinguished of whom were burnt on his funeral-pyre, according to the barbarous custom of these people.

Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka, his successor, appeared to rectify the mistakes of his father and throw off the yoke of thc Muhammadans. Resolved to refuse the annual tribute which they had imposed, he began to make preparations for a vigorous resistance, and furnished with soliders and munitions the fortress of Trichinopoly, which was the key to his dominions on the northern side. The king of Tanjore, instead of imitating his example and co-operating with him, sent his ambassadors to Idal Khan. While he wasted time in negotiations (**P.51**), the enemy's army crossed the mountains and appeared before Trichinopoly with a preparation which revealed its scheme to conquer all the country. Observing the warlike preparations of the Nāyak, it moved towards the east, pretending to devastate the surrounding country; then, at a time when one least expected it, it fell on Tanjore on the 19th of Marcb, 1659. This town, situated in the midst of a fertile plain, was not inferior to the strong citadels of Europe. Defended by a strong artillery and numerous troops, provisioned for several years, it could defy the besiegers, who had not a single cannon at their service. The commander of the fort, son-in-law of the Nayak, boldly ascended the ramparts, and was struck by an arrow, which inflicted a light wound

on him; at once his bravery vanished, and he gave up the place shamelessly. The *rājas* alone protested against this cowardice. These are warriors of a very noble caste, and renowned for their courage. They use only the sword and the lance; they scorn the bow and the gun, and level, as they themselues say, these arms to cowards who dare not face danger closely. Their maxim is never to retreat before the enemy; to conquer or die is to them a sacred law. Faithful to this law, they threw themselves desperately admist the conquerors, and met with a glorious death, which they prepared to a dishonourable life.

From Tanjore the Muhammadans marched to Mannārkōvil, so called from the idol of Mannār, whose son the Nāyak calls himself. This town, situated seven leagues east of the former, underwent the same fate. The third town in the kingdom was Vallamkōṭṭai (Vallam), three leagues south-east of Tanjore; on a steep rock within which ramparts are erected with incredible labour and expense. By its natural position, and fortification which art had added to it (p. 52), this fortress was considered impregnable; hence the Nāyak had confined in it his treasures and women and seemed resolute to defend it with all his energy. When the hour of peril was rung, he had no more faith in his courage than in the fidelity of his subjects; he sacrificed his dearest and fled to the forests of Talavarāyan, his vassal. The army of Idal Khan was not even put to the trouble of attacking this third citadel. Those who defended it, frightened by the capture of the two principal towns, despaired to resist an enemy so formidable. Besides, actuated only by the feeling of self-preservation, without any kind of devotion for a king who deserved so little of them, they believed that they would be safer in their impenetrable forests than behind their ramparts. As soon as night came to cover them, they escaped, one after another, without noise and with such parfect agreement, that, at daybreak, the commander found himself in a deserted town with only a few faithful officers. They themselves made up their mind to follow the fugitives: but, when going off, they wished to take their share of the treasures which they abandoned to the enemy; they opened the coffers of the Nāyak, took what they could carry of the most precious in gold, pearls, and precious stones, and fled to the most inaccessible forests. Their strength was not in proportion to their greed; they were obliged to abandon a part of their riches on the way, and soon they found themselves entirely relieved by the the Thieves who robbed them. The latter, informed of the condition of the fortress, hurried to it in crowds, placed one of them as guard at the gateway, and possessed themselves of these fabulous treasures which till then were not counted, but in measuring them by the bushel. Every one took in his cloth as many pieces of gold

and precious stones as he could carry; those who came late followed (P. 53) the footsteps of those proceeding before to gether what fell from them in going hurriedly.

This is without doubt the happiest episode of this war. These treasures, the fruits of the avarice of kings and of the labour of the poor, were thus saved from the rapacity of the Muhammadans, and divided among a crowd of indigent families, to whom they procured an honest life. The Thieves used them with more generosity than could be expected. Seeing the Nāyak in misery[4] they restroed to him a part of his riches, protesting that they had taken them only to preserve them safe. In the confusion of this pillage, the prisons were thrown open and a multitude of state prisoners were set free, the sole crime of most of whom being their fortune or social position. Among the latter were two brothers of the Nāyak, whom he had shut up in these prisons, after pulling out our their eyes to move all desire on their side of succeeding him (the Nāyak). At last, the Muhammadans arrived at Vallamkōṭṭai and found only the walls there; they put a small garrison in it and burst out on the country. They have already been, for several months, in possession of this beautiful and fertile country; no one knows now what their ulterior designs are, whether they will establish themselves there, or will content themselves with collecting the riches they can find there, and return to their country afterwards.

Such are the political events of the last three years.

(2) *Letter of Proenza to Paul Oliva, Trichinopoly*, 1662.

(P. 119) The continuous wars of the Dutch against the Portuguese have deprived us of news from Europe . . . .

The Muhammadans under the direction of Sagosi and Moula, the generals of Idal Khan, occupied the kingdoms of Gingi and Tanjore since two years, and seemed determined to fix their domination there. The people were not very uneasy thereby; they sufficiently accommodated themselves to the yoke of the conqueror, in whom they found less of cruelty and more of justice than in their own sovereigns. As for us, the hatred which these fanatics are showing to the Christians inspired in us grave misgivings. This is how the Divine Providence removed (delivered us from) them.

The commotions and devastations of the war would necessarily lead to famine; it was severe in all this country; the inhabitants retired to the provinces of Madura and Satyamangalam, where

(**P. 120**) the ravages were less terrible. The Muhammadans were the cause of this scourge; they were the first victims of it; the famine removed their men and horses in such large numbers that, not having the time to bury or burn them, they piled up the dead bodies in the fields. This folly gave rise to maladies and increased the mortality. At last, disunion (creeping in) among the generals and officers of the army completed the disaster.

Moula, frightened by the sad plight of his troops, proposed to the Nāyaks to leave the country in case they paid him the tribute of three years. He was concerned with men too well informed of his distress to respond to his proposal. The Nāyak of Tanjore, having nothing to lose or to give, held himself peacefully in his woods; that of Madura confined himself to the fortifications of Trichinopoly, defended by Lingama Nāyaka at the head of a strong garrison. The famine and the contagion forced Moula to abandon Tanjore; he came to besiege Trichinopoly with the *élite* of his soldiers. But, on the one hand, the view of this citadel, protected by the nature, surrounded by high walls and a very deep ditch; on the other, the courage of the besieged and the vigilance of the sentinels soon deprived him of all hope of surprising it by a ruse or taking it by force. He began to devastate the country, but this was to ravage a desert with much labour and without any profit; besides, it was harassed by the Thieves who, coming out of their woods in the night, fell on the detachments of the army, penetrated as far as the camp, and fled away with booty before they could be pursued. After considerable losses, he was obliged to accept a moderate sum offered by the Nāyak and retire beyond the mountains.

(**P. 121**) Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka did not enjoy long a peace obtained so cheaply. This prince who, at the commencement of his reign, had been more valiant than his father, Tirumala Nāyaka, delivered himself up to pleasures and voluptuousness with such fury, that, at first, he lost all energy of character, and, soon after, his health and life. He died of a malady contracted in his debauchery, and left his throne to his son, Śokkalinga (Chokkanātha) Nāyaka. This prince, aged sixteen, removed his court from Madura to Trichinopoly. His first minister was a Brahman, distinguished for his ability and experience; his secretary was an old confidant of the deceased king. These two persons, taking advantage of the youth of their master, arrogated to themselves all authority, and, to strengthen their power, removed, one after another, the lords and captains who could overshadow them, by exile and imprisonment. The young king, helped by his Brahman, conceived a daring project, whose execution did not transcend the resources of his talents. He

attempted to drive the Moghuls from all the countries they had invaded, to re-establish the ancient king of Bisnagar in his country, to give Gingi to its Nāyak, and thus to remove the evils that had resulted from the mistaken policy of Tirumala Nāyaka.

(With this object, he sent Lingama Nāyaka at the head of forty thousand men to attack General Sagosi and take possession of Gingi. The captain was renowned for his bravery and military talents; he could assure the success of the expedition, and realize the plan of the Brahman and his prince; but, won over by the presents of the enemy's general, he exhausted the royal treasure in a long and fruitless campaign. However, the two ministers reign alone at Trichinopoly, and excite the indignation of the inhabitants by their cruelty. The Nāyak, (**P. 122**) indignant at the disorders committed in his name, is powerless to remedy them: his palace has become a prison where the ministers shut him up, without allowing him any means of communication with his subjects. He seeks to deliver himself from such a slavery, and shows that he does not intend to be satisfied with the *rôle* which is imposed on him; but then the two traitors wish to depose him, and substitute his brother, still younger, in whose name they hope to govern more despotically. They associate Lingama Nāyaka in their plot, and, to facilitate its execution, dismiss or imprison all the lords remaining faithful (to the king). The prince, informed of this plot by a lady of the court, secretly sends an order to two captains exiled for their devotion. Immediately the latter gather a company of soldiers, come, all on a sudden, to attack the two ministers, cut the secretary to pieces, and pull out the eyes of the Brahman, whose rank screened him from a more rigorous punishment.)

The Nāyak, freed by his happy *coup de main*, hastens to call back around him the courtiers whose exile and imprisonment have proved their fidelity. Too weak to punish Lingama Nāyaka, he resolves to dissemble, and receives him with demonstrations of friendship; some months later, he wishes to seize his person; but the traitor, whose conscience renders him suspicious, cannot be deceived; he escapes and joins Sagosi. Soon he comes back with him, at the head of twelve thousand infantry and seven thousand cavalry, to besiege Trichinopoly. The army of the Nāyak numbers more than fifty thousand; but the treachery of the new Brahman, the successor and accomplice of the previous minister, creates a split, and brings about dissensions among the soldiers. By mutual agreement with the enemy, he ensnares (**P. 123**) the captains of the army, the bravest and the most devoted, who are massacred or made prisoners. Encouraged by this initial success, the traitor throws off the mask, turns against the town

with a part of his troops, and wishes to seize the king and depose him. The Nāyak, betrayed a second time, swears never more to trust the Brahmans, and seeks his safety in the rest of the army, whose command he himself assumes. This bold step electrifies the solidiers ; the forsaken rebels take to their heel; Lingama Nāyaka and Sagosi take refuge at Tanjore, whose Nāyak has favoured the project.

The presence of Śokkalinga Nāyaka re-establishes confidence in the army, and from all sides the soldiers hasten to range themselves under his banner. From the beginning of his career, he shows the talent and valour of an old captain; his justice and the wisdom of his orders make him loved by all; at the same time, his boldness and inflexible severity inspire salutary respect and fear. His reputation attracts to him the soldiers of the enemy's army, always ready to give their services to him who offers them chances of victory. At the head of more than seventy thousand well-disciplined warriors, he marches against Tanjore; the two generals flee towards Gingi, and the Nāyak submits to the conditions of the conqueror. Such is, in broad outlines, the picture of political events whose details to narrate to you in full would be useless.

(3) *Letter of Proenza to Paul Oliva, Cangoupatti*, 1665.

(**P. 158**) Our fear of the arrival of the Muhammadans was soon realized; the story of the disorders created and cruelties committed by them, and the desolation which they spread everywhere on their way, struck consternation in every heart. The warlike spirit and prudent administration of Śokkalinga Nāyaka, however, held out a ray of hope. At last the army of Idal Khan arrived, commanded by Vanamian, the most valiant of his captains, and stopped close to Trichinopoly which is, as it were, the key of the dominions of Madura. The general of the enemy tried at first to frighten the king by his threats and show of power; seeing that he gained nothing by these methods, he successively delivered several attacks, and was constantly repulsed with loss by the artillery of the fort. But, by his attacks, he destroyed all the suburbs, and our church, which was in one of them, was completely ruined. I myself ran a great danger: pursued by four horsemen, I fled towards the town with several disciples, and we were to fall into their hands, when some shells sent by the besieged burst near us, (**p. 159**) and made the enemy retire. After making fruitless attempts against the citadel, the besiegers broke out on the country, devastated the harvest, burnt the villages, and captured the inhabitants to be made slaves.

It is impossible to describe the scenes of horror which then enveloped this unhappy country. The Indian nobility, thinking it infamy to fall into the hands of these despicable beings, did not fear to seek refuge in death, less frightful, in their eyes, than such a dishonour. A large number, after slaying their women and children, plunged the sword into their own bodies and fell on their corpses. Entire populations were seen resorting to this tragic death. In other villages the inhabitants gathered together in several houses, to which they set fire and perished in the flames. A Christian woman, thus dragged into a big building to share the common fate, was recovered alive under a heap of four hundred corpses. These traits will enable you to understand how far the stubbornness of Indians goes in defending the prerogatives and honour of their castes. The Muhammadans, gathering all they could expect from pillage, and henceforth, seeing nothing more than expenses to make, without any profit, thought of retiring. They entered into negotiations with the Nāyak, who was very glad to get rid of them at the cost of a large sum of money which he paid them in the name of contribution.

Freed from this enemy, Śokkalinga Nāyaka thinks of wreaking vengeance on the king of Tanjore who has betrayed him again, in this circumstance, by joining the Moghuls against the fidelity of treaties. Accordingly, he marches at the head of a strong army, appears before the town of Tanjore, and, after many fights of minor importance, captures Vallam (p. 160), a most important fort by its position and by the rich lands which depend on it. He then makes peace with his defeated enemy on conditions which he is pleased to dictate to him, and returns home after leaving a good garrison in the fortress, of which he has just made the conquest.

He takes advantage of the spirit of his victorious troops to punish his vassal, the king of Marava, who, during the invasion of the Muhammadans, refused him the help of his arms. He captures Tiruppattūr, Pudukottai, Mānāmadurai, and some other placess less considerable; then he penetrates into the heart of the woods and captures the fort of Kāḷaiyārkōvil. The Marava king, the loss of whose strong places did not deprive him at all of his boldness, retires full of confidence to the heart of his forests. The Nāyak, tired of a war with robbers, further pressed to return to Madura to celebrate several ceremonies there, leaves the work of terminating this expedition to some captains. But his depature soon changes the aspect of affairs. The Marava knows how to profit by the advantages, which a knowledge of the places and the habit of fighting in these positions give him, all being new to his adversaries, and gains several victories over them. The Nāyak renounces the project of humbling the pride

of his vassal, and contents himself with keeping the princlpal fortresses of Marava.

(4) *Letter of André Freire to Paul Oliva, Candelour, 1666.*

(**P. 201**)...The three kingdoms in which this Mission is included continue to be governed: Madura by Śokkalinga Nāyaka, Tanjore by Vissarāya (Vijayarāghava) Nāyaka, and Gingi by three captains of Idal Khan. All the political events of this year consist in some changes of ministers. The *Pradhāni* of Tanjore, to fill the royal treasury and make his own fortune, gave to a Brahman the authorization to despoil all the vassals without any formality. Whoever by dint of labour and industry had gathered some amount of money was, by this alone, guilty, doomed to be proceeded against by the minister. In conveying this order, he had only the largest fortunes in view; but the Brahman, who had also a purse to fill, extended the decree to all ranks, and employed for execution means, so violent and cruel, that the inhabitants, seized with consternatioon, sought safety in flight. The (**P. 202**) artisans suspended their work; the merchants closed their shops; most of the people left their homes; and kingdom showed the appearance of a desert. The king could not ignore such barbarities; but, being himself thirsty of gold, he dissembled in the hope of gathering the fruits of these plunderings; then, when he thought the moment favourable to strike the blow, he understood that the minister had known how to take measures and remove his treasures. He took vengeance on him by giving him to the people's anger; this was the most equitable and severe punishment which he could inflict on him; for nothing is more terrible than the anger of the weak when impunity is assured them.

The *Pradhāni* of Madura, guilty of the same exactions, deserved the same corporal punishment; (but) the Nāyak, without removing him from his office, satisfied himself with imposing on him a fine of three hundred thousand *écus*. This means to punish his subject for crimes whose victims they had been; for the minister redoubled his cruelty to extort the sum which he had to pay to the king. See where the happy beginnings of this reign have come to after making every one hope for a golden age and a government full of wisdom and equity! The passions, in corrupting the heart of the young prince, have unnerved his courage and dulled his spirit. He amuses himself with building a substantial palace at Trichinopoly; with this object, he has destroyed a part of the magnificent palace which Tirumala Nāyaka had constructed at Madura, and has carried from it the most precious materials, among which are columns of black stone of rare beauty. He is thus ruining the most majestic monument of

these countries to construct, at the cost of the tears and blood of his subjects, a building which can never compare with that which he demolished.

But nothing can equal the cruelties which the (P. 203) Muhammadans employ in the government of Gingi; expression fails me to recount the atrocities which I have seen with my eyes; and if I were to describe them, truth would be incredible. To the present horror are added the fears of what is to happen; for it is announced that Idal Khan sends a strong army to raise the contributions, which the Nāyaks had promised, by force.

(5) *Letter of André Freire to Paul Oliva, Colei, 1676.*

(P. 247)...This account contains...the events which have taken place since my last letter of 1673.

The Nāyak of Madura, after the disastrous wars an account of which was given you in that letter, took possession of the kingdom of Tanjore and cut off the head of the king, his enemy. This barbarous action could not preserve his conquest. Idal Khan, informed of these events, sent an army under the command of General Ekoji to re-establish, on the throne of Tanjore, the son of the defeated king, who had gone to implore his help. The Nāyak of Madura had entrusted the command of the conquered kingdom to his elder brother (foster-brother, Alagiri Nāyaka), whose bravery at first checked the impetuosity of Ekoji. The latter resolved to contrive by stratagem a victory which he did not dare to hope by force; he remained, for one full year, on the frontiers of the (P. 248) kingdom, convinced that follies and muttual jealousies between the two brothers would afford him a favourable moment to accomplish his designs. He was not mistaken in his expectation. The Nāyak of Madura soon fell out with his brother, and Ekoji, profiting by this division, marched at the head of his troops, fell on the town of Tanjore, and, in the first attack, captured it and all its dedendencies, and appeared before the gates of Trichinopoly where the king of Madura was. The citadel and all the kingdom were about to be his conquest if his boldness had equalled his good fortune. He feared to compromise his success by delivering the assault immediately; and this hesitation gave the Nāyak time to recover from the panic which had demoralised him. He could defend himself and save his capital, but he was deprived of a large part of his dominions and of all the strong places in his provinces.

Such was the just punishment of a tyrant whose only law was his cupidity. His spoliations and cruelties had made the people forget

the despotism of all his predecessors, and excited against him the the execration of his subjects; he deserved to be treated as he himself had treated, not his enemies, but his own vassals.

The long series of wars has been followed by a general famine which ravages especially the environs of Madura and Marava. Everywhere only devastation and solitude of death are seen; a part of the inhabitants have succumbed to starvation; others have left their country to seek relief elsewhere. Day by day Ekoji, on the one hand, and the king of Mysore, on the other, will absorb the last *débris* of this kingdom, once so flourishing. The conquest of it will be very easy, for (**P. 249**) the people will regard the enemy, whoever he may be, as their true saviour.

This is what has just happened at Tanjore. General Ekoji, instead of placing the son of the late Nāyak on the throne, according to the orders of Idal Khan, has preferred to usurp the title and authority of an independent king. Thus becoming absolute master of the kingdom, he seeks to make himself loved by the inhabitants, and has already succeeded in it. The justice and wisdom of his government begin to heal the wounds of the preceding reign and develop the natural resources of this country, one of the most remarkable in all India by the fertility of its lands and the wealth of its production. By repairing the canals and tanks, he has fertilised extensive fields, uncultivated for many years, and the last harvest has surpassed all that one had ever seen. Unhappily this prosperity will not be of long duration, for, on the one hand, Idal Khan sends an army to punish the revolt of his general; on the other, the Nāyak of Madura, so sluggish when it would have been easy for him to join his brother to crush Ekoji, is at last waking himself up from his apathy. He is raising a formidable army, in agreement with all his vassals, who have forgotten their own quarrels to unite their forces against the common enemy. At the same time, Mysore, which cannot see without uneasiness, a bold set of people establishing themselves on her own frontiers, fortifies the citadels taken from the northern provinces of Madura, gathers fresh troops, and makes grand preparations for war. On the pretext of strengthening herself against the Muhammadans, she may have in view an attack on the kingdom of Madura, when the Nāyak will be involved in his war with Tanjore. Everything (**P. 450**) indicates that we are not still at the end of our troubles.

The kingdom of Gingi has not suffered less from the wars which the usurpers make among themselves. A Brahman, brother of the governor of Gingi, formed a conspiracy against Idal Khan or the

subah of the Dakhan. His intrigues were discovered; he himself fell into the snare he had got ready, and was killed by the *subah* at the moment when he meditated to deliver the fatal *coup*. Some grave suspicions falling on the brother of the conspirator, another general was sent at the head of a detachment of soldiers with orders to depose the present governor of Gingi and take his place. But he encountered such strong resistance that he was obliged to retire. Accordingly, he left the capital and turned all his efforts to the provinces. Thus resulted a series of bloody combats, which ruined this unhappy country, already reduced to profound misery by the tyranny of the three ministers who govern or rather ravage this kingdom.

(6) *Letter of André Freire to Paul Oliva, Viranam, in the kingdom of Gingi,* 1678.

(**P. 268**) I begin this letter as usual by an exposition of the political events whose influence our Mission has had to submit to. As I have told you in my last letter, the Nāyak of Madura was preparing for a war with Ekoji, the old captain of Idal Khan, (**P. 269**) now independent master of Tanjore and a part of Gingi. Meanwhile it was reported that Sabagi (Sivaji), the elder brother of Ekoji, in revolt against his sovereign for some time, had seized several provinces of Bisnagar and advanced at the head of a strong army. This news appeared incredible; how to believe that Sabagi could traverse a distance of several hundreds of leagues through (the country of) the warlike people of the Dakhan and Golkonda to carry war into our country? While the probability of this rumour was argued about, Sabagi solved the question by falling, like a thunder-bolt, on the citadel of Gingi, which he took at the first assault. He owed this easy success to the divisions which prevailed, and to the numerous communications which he had carefully conducted with the Muhammadans.

After subduing the kingdom of Gingi, the new conqueror pretends to respect the provinces possessed by his brother, and advances as if to pay a friendly visit to him. Ekoji, full of confidence, comes jovially to meet him, and finds him beyond the Coleroon, three leagues from Tanjore. But natural sentiments are suppressed by greed and ambition; the traitor seizes his brother and puts him in chains to extort from him all the treasures (he had) gathered from the exploitation of the kingdom of Tanjore. Ekoji, having managed to escape, crosses the river swimming and hides himself in the woods; Sabagi recompenses himself by taking possession of all the provinces north of the Coleroon. Then he entrusts most of his army to one of his brothers Santogi (Santaji), the most (**P. 270**) valiant captain in

all these countries, gives him a Brahman as counsellor, whose sagacity and experience equal his devotion, entrusts him with the defence of his conquests, and flees to the north to help his son, (who is) severely pressed by the troops of the Great Moghul.

Ekoji, profiting by this diversion to re-establish his affairs, gathers his soldiers, crosses the river, and enters the territory of Gingi. Santogi comes to give him battle at the head of an army, superior in number, and commanded by clever and intrepid captains; but he attacks men whose wives he has dishonoured and whose children he has massacred in the sack of Gingi; the desire for vengeance increases their natural courage; actuated by fury, they fall on the enemy's army like lions, break the ranks, spread carnage everywhere, and turn the victory to their side. But, all on a sudden, art and strategem snatch away the victory from blind courage. Santogi, obliged to flee, keeps enough composure to place a big detachment in ambuscade; the victors carried away by the dash of success fall into the snare; overtaken in the rear by this detachment, they suddenly see the fugitives turn against them with irresistible impetuosity. After a bloody combat of several hours they are broken, and they leave the battle-field and the honour of victory to Santogi, whose losses are, neverthless, much more considerable than those of the conquered,

While the two armies were fighting, the Nāyak of Madura came with his troops against Ekoji. The occasion was opportune to capture Tanjore; he did not know how to take advantage of it. The defeated re-crossed the Coleroon under his eyes and returned in disosder to their fortress. Instead of attacking them, or entering the town along with (**P. 271**) them, to impose his law there, he wasted his time in hesitation; then he joined Santogi, who promised to hand over to him the citadel and all the kindom of Tanjore in return for a sum of money for the maintenance of his army. But Ekoji, whose treasure was in better condition to satisfy the cupidity of Sabagi, made peace with him and retained possession of his dominions. The cowardly and imprudent Nāyak lost his time and money, and went to the citadel of Trichinopoly to hide himself in disgrace.

Making his conquests secure, Santogi rejoined his brother, (who was) occupied with the siege of Vellore, once the capital of Bisnagar. After a year of investment, Sabagi made himself master of it, and thereby became sovereion of a large part of the kingdom, as he was already (master) of Gingi. He could not hope to maintain peaceful possession of it for long; he had to defend himself against the Moghul power which has been irresistible till now. With this pre-vision, he

appiied all the energy of his mind, and all the resources of his dominions, to the fortification of the principal towns. He constructed new ramparts around Gingi, dug ditches, erected towers, created basins, and executed all these works with a perfection which European art would not have denied. He did as much for the other citadels, whose position promised real advantages, destroyed all those which he considered useless, constructed a large number of new ones in the plains and hills, and put all these fortresses in a state of preparedness for a siege of several years.

Such works necessarily exhausted his treasures; he compensated himself by universal pillage in the country, whose riches were hoarded in the citadels. His orders were carried out with such rigour and barbarity that most of the inhabitants sought safety (**P. 272**) in exile. Those who could not leave their homes are still groaning under this iron yoke, which makes them forget all past evils, and sighing for the arrival of the Moghuls, whom they are disposed to join to crush the new despot. Such is the state of desolation that prevails in the kingdoms of Gingi and Vellore; I do not enter into details; words fail me to tell the horrors that we are witnessing

For her part, Tanjore, pressed by Ekoji, had to contribute the sum which this prince had paid to buy his dominions back. To these internal troubles were added the brigandages and devastations of the Maravas who, without daring to attack the Muhammadans in regular battle, did not cease to harass them and surprise their detachments. Nevertheless, these people found in the fertility of their soil and the abundant harvest of this year a relief to their misery.

Let me add a word on the state of the kingdom of Mudura. Whilst Śokkalinga Nāyaka, egged on by his ambition, sought to seize Tanjore, he lost his own dominions. The king of Mysore entered them, without striking a blow, and took possession of the only two fortesses which Madura had preserved till then in the north, The principal lords of the kingdom, vexed at the conduct of the Nāyak, conspired against him, put him in prison, on the pretext of madness, and raised to the throne Muttulinga Nāyaka, his brother whose government is neither wiser nor less tyrannical. All over the country only lamentations and imprecations are heard against the authors of such cruelties. To make matters worse, the whole country has been devastated by a kind of deluge: in the provinces of Satyamangalam, Trichinopoly, Tanjore, and Gingi, the inundations have carried away whole villages (**P. 273**) with all their inhabitants. This scourge of divine anger was soon followed by famine, pestilence, and, at last brigandage which infests all the kingdom. The capital, once so flourishing, is no longer recognizable; its palaces, once so rich and

majestic, are deserted and begin to fall into ruins; Madura resembles a town much less than a den of robbers. The new Nāyak is *par excellence* a *roi fainéant*: he sleeps, day and night, and his neighbours, who do not sleep, dispossess him every moment of some shred of his dominions. The people, who have only to gain by a change of domination, do not care to resist the invaders; and everyone forbodes that this kingdom, so powerful twenty years ago, will soon be a prey to its enemies, or rather, the victim of the mad policy of its own government. Without dwelling longer on the political events which would make up a voluminous history, I pass on to the work of the Mission, which is my principal object.

(7) *Letter of André Freire to Paul Oliva, Vadugarpatti, 1682.*

(**P. 301**)..... The kings of these countries cannot understand that ambition and unjust cruelty, which direct their government, are the sole cause of all the misfortunes that befall them, and of the total ruin to which they are rushing blindly. Ever since the fatal policy of Tirumala Nāyaka who invited the Moghul army to help the three Nāyaks in revolt against Bisnagar, this part of India has been incessantly delivered to all the disorders of anarchy and to the ravages of the most disastrous wars. Far from profiting by their reverses and rectifying their faults, seeking their safety in union and in the wise administration of their kingdoms, these princes (**P.** (**302**) have weakened themselves by their mutual treasons, and drained the source of their wealth by a tyranny, of which nothing can give you an idea. Already (the sovereign of) Bisnagar, the Nāyak of Gingi, and that of Tanjore are despoiled of their dominions. The Nāyak of Madura is on the verge of succumbing to the same fate: his provinces are invaded, on the one side by Ekoji, and, on the other, by the king of Mysore, who holds him in blockade in his fortress of Trichinopoly.

It would be too long to recount to you the troubles which have convulsed this kingdom during these last years. You know, from the previous letters, that Śokkalinga Nāyaka was dethroned and imprisoned, on the pretext of madness, and that Muttulinga Nāyaka, his brother, took his place, without exhibiting either more wisdom or more humanity. The change of masters, by stirring up new passions only increased the misfortunes of the subjects and disorders of the government. This state of things lasted for a short time; a Muhammadan general (Rustam Khan), who was in the king's service as commanded his cavalry, taking advantage of a walk which the prince took beyond the fortresss, rebelled against him, closed the gates of the citadel, and seized the government. To make a show of justice, he took Śokkalinga out of prison and declared him king; but,

in reality, he reserved to himself all authority and all the privileges of royalty. Supported by his cavalry, he imposed his yoke on the whole kingdom without anybody daring or wishing to make opposition; the usurper, not content with seizing all the treasures of the palace, appropriated the wives of the two kings, two of whom committed suicide to avoid this dishonour.

(**P. 303**) This new tyranny weighed heavily on the kingdom for nearly two years, and came to an end only through a new disaster. Kumāra Rāya (Daḷavāy Kumāraiya), the Mysore general, attacked Trichinopoly with a strong army; the commander of the place, enticed by the enemy, made an imprudent sally, fell into an ambuscade, and lost nearly all his cavalry in it. When he returned to the citadel, Śokkalinga, helped by his devoted friends,[1] fell on him and massacred him with the Muhammadans who accompanied him. Delivered from this domestic enemy, the Nāyak found himself surrounded by four large armies, the first was that of Kumāra Rāya who besieged him; the second, that of the Maravas, who came on the pretext of defending their sovereign, but whose sole object was to get their share of the pillage, in which they knew how to distinguish themselves on that occasion; the third was that of Araśumalai, general of Sambogi (Sambaji), son and successor of Sabagi; the fourth, that of Ekoji. The two latter pretended to help the Nāyak who had called them; but their real motive was to repulse the army of Mysore, whose proximity they feared, and take possession of all the dominions of Madura. For his part, Kumāra Raya, realizing that it was impossible for him to resist such armies with troops so inferior in number, offered peace to the Nāyak, promising to preserve his kingdom for him, and re-establish the successors of the ancient Nāyaks of Tanjore and Gingi. These promises were as flattering as they were short of being sincere. Undoubtedly the wisest course would have been to make a league with the king of Mysore to chase the Moghuls. A little energy, supported by the confidence of the people, would have assured the execution of a project in which the two kings had an equal interest. It would have been curious to see the Nāyak of Madura join his enemy (**P. 304**) to fight and destroy the allies whom he had called to his help. In the ways and manners of the country, the conduct would not have astonished anybody; it would not, beside have gone against justice except in name, for everyone perfectly knew what the Nāyak could expect from these allies. Moreover, it was not justice which stood in his way in entering into the views, and accepting the proposals, of Kumāra Rāya. On the one hand, he

Chiefly the Sētupati, instructed by Gōvindappaiya.

could scarcely count more on his word than on that of the Muhammadans; on the other, his heart was incapable of a project, which required courage and noble determination. Accordingly, he was pleased to remain idle spectator of a struggle which must decide as to who, among these competitors, would be his master and the possessor of his dominions.

At the same time, Kumāra Rāya made overtures to General Araśumalai and offered him large sums of money to corrupt his fidelity, and pledge him to retire to Gingi. By these negotiations he hoped to give time to the king of Mysore to send him help which he had applied for; but his letters fell into the hands of his rivals who, sacrificing the interests and glory of the prince and of their personal jealousy, had kept away these despatches to ruin the general. Receiving neither reinforcements nor reply to his letters, the latter was obliged to seek safety in honourable retreat. He ordered the cavalry corps to feign a movement to attract the attention of the enemies, to engage them as long as possible, and then flee with full speed towards Mysore; while he himself would take advantage of this diversion to escape, with his infantry, in an opposite direction and thus save his army. But the Moghuls would not allow themselves to be put on the wrong scent; for a long time past their self-conceit and audacity (**P. 305.**) had been increasing by the inaction of Kumāra Rāya, which revealed to them his weakness and their strength; they kept close to his army and none of his actions could escape them. Thus, when the cavalry effected its movement, they followed it very calmly without inviting a combat, reserving all their strength to crush the body of the army; besides, this cavalry, demoralized by its sad position, could properly execute only the last part of the orders it had received; it did that wonderfully well, and with all the more facility, that the Moghuls did not wish to waste time in pursuit. Tnen, they fell on the infantry, and the combat was only a horrible butchery; they found rich booty, the result of several years' pillage and made a large number of prisoners, among whom was Kumāra Rāya himself. The defeat and capture of this general, till then invincible, completed the joy and pride of Araśumalai.

Taking advantage of his glorious victory, he extended his conquests by driving the Mysoreans from all the provinces and from nearly all the citadels, which they had taken from the Nāyak of Madura. He had promised to re-establish the latter in his dominions as an inducement to get his help in troops and money; but, as was to be expected of him, this promise has never been fulfilled. Sambogi is now in possession of all the places conquered by Araśumalai, who continues to chase the Mysoreans. The latter still possesses some

fortresses, among others that of Madura, with the help of the Maravas, to whom Mysore appears a neighbour less redoubtable than Sambogi. The Nāyak, frustrated in all his hopes, dispossessed of his dominions and all his treasures, abandoned by his troops, deprived of all resources, and attacked by Sambogi in his fortress of Trichinopoly, more vigorously than he had been by (P. 306) the army of Mysore, fell into a fit of melancholy which caused his death. This event made little impression on his subjects and vassals, from whom he had deserved neither love nor confidence, and whom the presence of a foreign tyrant rendered insensible to the joy of deliverance from a domestic tyrant. What lessons for these princes and kings, if they were capable of understanding and learning them! Śokkalinga Nāyaka was succeeded by his son, Muttu Krishṇa (Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa) Nāyaka, aged fifteen. It can be imagined what kind of government would exist under a prince so young and so weak. All the country is plunged in complete anarchy and universal pillage; the enemies occupy the citadels; the Thieves are masters of the fields, villages and towns, and carry on their plunderings everywhere with complete impunity.

I shall say little about Tanjore; the tyranny of Ekoji continues his work of destruction there. After plundering the men, he has fallen on the *pagoḍas* of his own idols. One had never seen so much temerity in a pagan, but he is a pagan who has no other god than his cupidity. To satisfy it he has appropriated the treasures of the *pagoḍas* and their large possessions. The Brahmans came in vain to lament and represent to him taat their gods were abandoned without offerings, because the rice-fields, whose produce was intended for their worship had been taken away from them. He replied to them that the gods did not eat rice, and that offerings of fragrant flowers would suffice. It can be judged from this how Ekoji treats his unhappy subjects. To his tyranny are added other disasters. An inundation, less strong in the interior of the country than that of 1677, has wrought horrible ravages on the sea-coast, because it has been accompanied by a terrible gust of (P. 307) wind which, carrying the sea beyond its limits, has turned back the waters of the rivers. In the villages of the sea-coast alone, more than 6,000 persons have been the victims of this disaster.

In the kindom of Gingi, the death of Sabagi has not caused any political change; his son Sambogi already shows himself a tyrant, more cruel and perfidious than his father. It is impossible to enumerate the exactions, brigandages, and murders which desolate this poor kingdom. New calamities and fresh political changes are talked about; it is said that the Moghul, at the request of Mysore, is sending

a formidable army against Sambogi. In the meantime, the latter pursues his conquests against Mysore, not only in the kingdom of Madura, but even in the northern provinces, where he has taken several of its fortresses, all the province of Dharmapuri, and other neighbouring territories. It seems that he is helped by Iquerian (Ikkērian), or the king of Canary, and by the king of Golkonda, both of whom are united against (the king of) Mysore (who is) regarded as the common enemy. I am much afraid lest a sad experience should teach them what the example of our three Nāyaks ought to have done, viz. that their real enemies are Ekoji and Sambogi with their savage hordes. In December, 1680, appeared a comet, which covered an arc of 90° in the sky; it was followed, a little after, by another, much less extensive, in the same part of the sky. The Indians who ascribe to these dreadful stars the same influences, which the general opinion of Europe has always imputed to them, make them invariably responsible for all the evils which have afflicted these countries, and for all those which they expect in the ensuing years.

(8) *Letter of Jean de Britto to Paul Oliva,* 1683.

(**P. 337**)...I shall not dwell on the civil government of these countries, if, however, this name must still be given to the brigandages which desolate them. The ancient kingdom of Madura is in shreds: the Nāyak keeps a small portion of it, another is occupied by the king of Mysore, a third by the petty king of Marava, a fourth by Sambogi, lastly, a fifth by Ekoji. You can infer from this the universal disorder that prevails in all these provinces.

The power of the king of Mysore in Madura begins to grow weak, because, violently attacked in his own dominions by the troops of Sambogi, he cannot sustain and reinforce the armies he had sent to (**P 338**) these countries The provinces he had conquered there shake off his yoke gradually to claim their independence, or become attached to some one of the princes who have partitioned the shreds of this kingdom, once so flourishing, among themselves,

Tanjore, with the exception of some provinces captured by the king of the Maravas, is under Ekoji. This is briefly a picture of the administration of this country. Ekoji takes off four-fifths of all the produce. As if this were not enough, he enforces payment in money, instead of accepting this four-fifths in kind; and as he is careful to fix the price himself, much above that which the owner can realize, it happens that the sale of the whole harvest is never sufficient to pay

the contributions. Accordingly, the cultivators are burdened with a crushing debt, and often they are obliged to prove their inability, when they have to pay it, by (undergoing) barbarous tortures.

It will be difficult for you to conceive of such oppression, and I must add, however, that, in the kingdom of Gingi, tyranny is even more frightful and revolting. Further this is all I shall say about it, for, expression fails me to tell you how horrible it is.

(9) *Letter of Louis de Mello to Noyelle* 1686

(**P. 376**) The political condition of these kingdoms presents the same intestine broils and confusion, as in the previous years; it is the labour of dissolution which continues its work till the great powers of the north (**P. 377**) come to terminate it by a general invasion. In the south, the petty *rājas*, once vassals of Madura, continue to shake off the yoke of Mysore, too weak to preserve her conquests; the Theives and the Maravas make a war of brigandage against the troops of Ekoji; Sambogi mercilessly conducts war against the king of Mysore, whose dominions he is invading, and is strongly helped by the revolts of the inhabitants against their own sovereign.

In the midst of all these commotions, the Mission has, during these three years, experienced shocks and persecutions more terrible than all those which had afflicted it till now. Proceeding in order, I shall first tell you about the persecutions at Satyamangalam, Tanjore and Marava; then, I shall put in a word about the progress of religion, fertilised with such tears and blood.

Attacked in the heart of his kingdom by the armies of Sambogi, the king of Mysore, to provide for the expenses of the war, resorted in the eastern provinces of his dominions, to exactions and cruelties so revolting that his subjects rose in a body against him and all his ministers. Stimulated by the losses which weakened him on all sides, driven by the impulse of the present sufferings without any thought of what was to happen, destitute, moreover, of sentiments of patriotism and national grandeur, like all enslaved people, they chose as their generals two Brahmans, chiefs of the sects of Vishṇu and Śiva, and formed two large armies. The one composed of seventy thousand men marched straight against the fortress of Mysore and besieged the king who shut himself up there; the second composed of thirty thousand men burst out on the province of Satyamangalam and the adjoning countries. I shall not stop to describe the horrors which (**P. 378**) these masses, excited by the spirit of vengeance and blind fanaticism, perpetrated. After discharging

their first fury on the officers of the king and many magistrates, the two generals took advantage of the occasion to vent their hatred against our neophytes and destroy Christianity.

LA MISSION DU MADURÉ, II

(10) *Letter of Antoine Vico to Laerzio, Madura, 30th August,* 1611.

POLITICAL CONDITION

(**P. 124**) The king, or the great Nāyak of Madura, has but little domains which are directly dependent on him, that is to say, which are his property (for, in this country, the nobles are the sole owners of the land, and the people are only their farmers). All the other lands are the property of a crowd of petty princes or tributary lords; the latter have, each in his domain, the complete administration of the police and justice, if ever justice there was. They raise contributions which are at least half the produce of the lands; they divide them into three parts, the first of which is reserved as tribute to the great Nāyak; the second part is employed for the upkeep of the troops which the lord has to furnish him with, in case of war; the third belongs to the lord. The great Nāyak of Madura and those of Tanjore and Gingi are themselves tributaries of Bisnagar, to whom they pay or have to pay each an annual tribute of six to ten million *francs*. But they are not punctual in paying it; often they postpone the payment; sometimes they even refuse it with insolence. In that case, (the king of) Bisnagar comes or sends one of his generals, at the head of hundred thousand men, to make them pay all the arrears with interest. On these occasions, which are frequent, it is again the poor peopole who pay for the fault of their princes; all the country is devasted, and the people are plundered or massacred...

Hermécatti is tributary to the king. All the quarter of the town (**P. 125**), a small corner of which we occupy, belongs to him. He has domains enough to be obliged to maintain for the Nāyak's service three thousand infantry, two hundred horses, and fifty elephants. In his capacity as owner of the quarter we inhabit, this lord, very Influential at the court, could render us all evil he would wish....

(11) *Letter of Martinz to Carraffa, Satyamangalam,* 1651.

(**P. 394**) The death of the Nāyak of Satyamangalam and the minority of his son have made us experience the fatal consequences of bad government which exists in India in general. The idea of a

monarch who regards his people as a large family, of which he is the father, never enters into the mind or heart of the Indian kings. They rather consider themselves great proprietors and their kingdom a vast farm to exploit. Full of energy and sagacity to extort from their subjects the largest amount of money possible, they are blind, negligent, and excessively weak in (**P.395**) all that concerns order and repression of crime and injustice. All these duties are abandoned to subordinates, chiefs of castes and governors of provinces and villages. The latter are themselves so many petty despots, clever to make themselves independent, or maintain their despotism by intrigues, or presents to satisfy the greed of those who would supervise their work.

LA MISSION DU MADURÉ IV

(12) *Letter of Martin to Villette, Marava,* 1713

(**P. 194**) ... In 1709 drought and extraordinary heat produced a great scarcity ... . When there is abundant rain, rice and other provisions are very cheap here. One *faṇom* will procure up to eight *maraikkāls* or large measures, of very fine husked rice, which is sufficient to feed a man for more than fifteen days. But when (**P 195**). there is lack of rain, it becomes so dear that I have seen the price of one of these measures of rice mount up to four *faṇoms* . . .

(**P. 200**) Almost all the villages and lands of Marava are possessed by the richest in the country in return for a certain number of soldiers they have to furnish to the prince whenever he requires them. These lords keep their position at the prince's pleasure; their relatives, friends or slaves who cultivate the lands . . . and take to arms when required. In this way the Marava prince can collect even thirty or forty thousand men in less than eight days; hence he is feared by the neighbouring princes. He has even thrown off the yoke of the king of Madura, whose tributary he was. In vain did the king of Tanjore and Madura join together to subdue him. The famous Brahman Narasappaiya. the great general of Madura, came into Marava in 1702 at the head of a considerable army, was completely defeated, and he lost his life. The king of Tanjore was not more fortunate in 1709; taking advantage of the desolation which prevailed then in Marava, he sent all his forces into it, but his army was (**P. 201**) vigorously repulsed, and he had to sue for peace...

(**P. 203**)...I was in 1710 that the prince of Marava died aged more than eighty. His wives numbering about forty-seven were burned on his pyre....

(**P. 206**) ...The Queen of Trichinopoly, mother of the reigning prince, who was pregnant when her husband died about twenty years ago, made the same resolution (to burn herself to death) as soon as a son would be born to her, and carried it out with a firmness which astonished the whole court. Her mother-in-law, Mangammāl could not accompany King Chokkanātha on his pyre for the same reason, but, after her delivery, she hit upon an expedient to escape the flames, the pretext being that there was none but hereself to bring up the young prince and govern the kingdom during his minority. As she loved the Queen of Trichinopoly, her daughter-in-law, she wished to persuade her to follow her example ; but this young queen, regarding it with contempt, said to her, 'Do you believe that I am so devoid of feeling as to survive my husband? The desire to leave him a successor has made me postpone my sacrifice; but, at present, nothing can prevent it. The young prince will lose nothing by my death, since he has a grandmother who has great attachment for life. He is as much to you as to me; rear him up and preserve the kingdom which belongs to him.' (**P. 207**) She added many more cutting reproaches, but in a veiled manner. Mangammāl dissembled like a sensible woman and abandoned her daughter-in-law to her deplorable infatuation.

APPENDIX B

JOHN LOCKMAN, *Travels of the Jesuits* [1]

VOLUME I

(1) *Letter of Father Bouchet to Father Le Gobien. Madura, December* 1, 1700

(P. 9) Our Mission at Madura is in a more flourishing state than ever. We have suffered four violent persecutions this year. One of our missionaries had four of his teeth beat out; and I am now at the Prince's court to solicit for the liberty of Father Borghese, of the family of prince Borghese in Rome; that Father having been confined forty days in the prison of Ticherapali (the city in which the king of Madura resides). You have often heard that the missionaries of Madura eat neither meat, fish, nor eggs; and that they never drink wine or other strong liquors, but live in wretched huts covered with straw, having not so much as a bed, a chair or piece of furniture of any kind; and they are forced to take their food without either table, napkin, knife, fork or spoon **(P. 10)**. But this is nothing to the sufferings they undergo.

(2) *Letter of Father Peter Martin to Father Le Gobien, Camien-naken-patti, in the kingdom of Madura, 1st June,* 1700

(P. 366) As soon as the Provincial had granted my request, viz. of my engaging in the Mission of Madura, I applied myself assiduously to the study of the Tamul or Malabar language, that I might soon be enabled to enter upon my Mission. The Fathers of that province having (have) wisely ordered, that no person, except he be well skilled in the language of the country, shall be permitted to teach the Christian religion in Madura. Was not this precaution observed, we should soon be discovered, and all our designs frustrated. I had not an opportunity, in Topo, of improving in the

[1] Published in two volumes on the 20th of March, 1762, being translations from the *Letters edifiantes et curiuses, écrites des Missions étrangers, par les Missionaries de la Compagnie de Jesus.* Some of them are the same as those contained in Bertrand's *La Mission du Maduré*, IV.

language as expeditiously as I desired; and it is not spoken with propriety enough on the sea coasts, these being inhabited only by rude, ignorant people. For this reason, the Provincial was pleased to send me to Cotate (Kōṭṭāru?), where I might have more leisure and a better opportunity of learning the language. A circumstance that gave me the greatest pleasure was my meeting there with Father Maynard who has (**P. 367**) the care of that church. Being born in that country, of French parents, he is perfectly well skilled in both languages.

Cotate (Kōṭṭāru?) is a pretty large town, standing at the foot of the mountains of Cape Comorin, whence it is distant only about four leagues. This town, which is the boundary of the kingdom of Travancor southward, is as much exposed, as the rest of the country, to the incursions of the Badages, who come almost every year from the kingdom of Madura, to plunder the territories of the king of Travancor, who is one of the most inconsiderable princes in India, and tributary to the king of Madura. But as he never pays this tribute willingly, the Badages are sometimes forced to enter his kingdom, sword in hand, in order to levy it. He yet might easily secure himself from insults, and even render his kingdom inaccessible on that side, as the Badages can scarce come into it, except by a narrow pass between mountains. Was this pass (**P. 368**) shut up by a strong wall, and a small body of troops lodged there, it would be impossible for the most powerful army to force it. This would secure Cotate, and the rest of the country, from being plundered almost yearly; otherwise it will be impossihle for the king of Travancor to make head against so great a number of enemies, whom he never overcame but once, and that by their imprudence. This incident is singular enough to merit a place here.

The Badages had advanced as far as Corculam, the capital and chief fortress of Travancor; and the king himself, by a turn in politics, which perhaps is not to be parallelled, had put the citadel of it into their hands. This prince, being more judicious and brave than the Indian princes are commonly found, was grieved to see his kingdom (**P. 369**) possessed by eight ministers, who, from time immemorial, leaving the prince the bare title of sovereign, usurped the whole authority and divided among themselves all the revenues of the crown. To rid himself of these imperious subjects, who are now become his masters, he made a secret treaty with the Badages, by which he promised to deliver up to them part of his dominions, together with his fortress, upon condition, that they should free him from his ministers, who kept him in a dependent state. It would have been height of folly in him thus to receive the enemy into the heart

of his dominions, and, by attempting to break eight small chains, to have loaded his neck with one infinitely more weighty, had he not at the same time so contrived matters, as to be able to drive the Badages out of the kingdom, when they should have put him in a condition to recover the regal power. The Badages made their incursions as usual, without meeting with almost the least opposition, and advanced as far as his capital city; where the monarch, with those forces which he had won over, joined them, and gave them up the place. Immediately one or two of the usurping ministers were put to death, upon which the rest either fled, or saved their lives by dint of money. The prince also pretended to be seized with fear; but, instead of hiding himself, he drew together his scattered forces, and, on a sudden, besieged the fortress of Corculam. The Badages, who did not expect to be thus attacked, were overpowered, on which occasion a great number of them were killed in the city; and the rest fled in disorder towards their own country. The monarch pursued them, when, the people joining with him, a great slaughter was made of the barbarians before they had time to recover themselves, so that very few escaped to inform their countrymen of the news (P. 370). The king of Travancor, after this victory, returned in triumph to his capital city, and took the reins of of government into his own hands. He was beginning to strike terror into his enemies, when such of his former ministers, whose lives he had spared, and left them wherewithal to live honourably, engaged in a couspiracy, and caused him to be assassinated as he was one day coming out of his palace. However, this valiant prince made them pay dear for his life, he killing two of the murderers, and wounding a third in a desperate manner; but at last he himself fell, his body being quite covered with wounds. He was greatly regretted by all his subjects, and especially by the Christians, whom he loved and favoured on all occasions. These ministers who had formed the conspiracy against him, again seized on the government; and to preserve some image of the regal power, they placed a sister of the king's on the throne. She is but the shadow of a Queen; and, to give an idea of her authority, and the strength of the kingdom, I shall present you with the following instance:—Some fisherman having taken a buffalo, which happened to fall into the sea, resolved to sell it for their own profit; but the Queen's officers seizing it, sent it to the Princess in question as a considerable present. However, she did not keep it long; for, one of the governors having a fancy for it, sent in a letter in the most haughty manner to demand it. The Queen, being greatly surprised at the minister's incivility, was yet forced to send him the buffalo, and to beg his pardon for presuming to accept of it without his consent.

The tragedy described above was perpetrated about two or three years before my arrival at Cotate (**P. 371**). This city, one of the most considerable of this small kingdom, is divided among the ministers, so that the Queen has not the least power there... I arrived at Cotate a few days before the fastival of St. Fsancis Xavier... soon after which I went back to Topo (**P. 372**); I having promised to return to Cotate at Christmas, in order to apply myself assiduously to the study of the Malabar language. I made a great progress therein, in a short time, by the assistance of Father Maynard, who took surprising pains with me (**P. 373**). I now set out, by order of the Provinicial, for Tala, on the Fishing-Coast. In my journey (**P. 374**) ...I observed (at Comorin) a vest stone Pagod... (which) stands north and south, and directly opposite to the mountains, which separate the kingdoms of Travancor and Madura. If a line were drawn through this Pagod and those mountains which are but a league and a half from it, there would be an exact division between these two kingdoms....

(**P. 375**)......Formerly there were a great number of towns on the Fishing-Coast (which) is famous all over the world; but ever since the power of the Portuguese has been weakened in India, and they have not been able to protect this coast, the most considerable towns are abandoned. There now remain but certain poor villages, the chief were of Tala, Manapar, Alandaley, Pundicael, and some others. But I must except Tutucurin, this being a city of above fifty thousand inhabitants, partly Christians, and the rest idolaters.

When the Portuguese first came into India, the Paravas, or inhabitants of the Fishing-Coast, groaned under the government of the Moors, who had seized upon part of the kingdom of Madura. In this extremity, their chief resolved to implore the assistance of the Portuguese; and to put himself, with his whole caste, under their protection (**P. 376**)......The Paravas promised to turn Christians. This treaty was no sooner concluded, but the Portuguese drove the Moors out of the whole country and settled themselves in various places. It was then the Christian religion flourished on the Fishing-Coast, which was owing to the well-known labours of St. Francis Xavier.... By the liberty which the Paravas were allowed under the Portuguese, to trade with their neighbours, they became rich and powerful; but ever since they failed of the protection of the Portuguese (the Dutch drove the Portuguese out of their settlements), they have been oppressed and reduced to extreme poverty. Their greatest trade at this time is in the fish they catch, which they carry up into the country, and exchange for rice and other necessary provisions, of which that coast is wholly unprovided, it being covered

merely with a kind of brambles, with a dry burning sand. I see nothing else in the space of twelve leagues, from Cape Comorin to Tala, except seven or eight villages, in each of which is a church subordinate to that of Tala.

......These beasts (tigers) have made a surprising havoc on the whole coast this year. Besides the (**P. 377**) cattle......above seventy persons have disappeared......(**P. 378**). After having visited the several churches of my district, I returned, in Easter-week, to Tala ..

I now received a letter from the Provincial, by which I was ordered to prepare for the Mission of Madura. That moment I set out for Topo where, (**P. 379**) after receiving the necessary orders and instructions from my Superior, I proceeded in my journey to Madura. After crossing Cape Comorin again, I came off Tutucurin. This city is very near at an equal distance between Cape Comorin and the straits of Ramanakoiel......

(**P. 380**) Tutucurin appears a handsome town to those who arrive at it by sea. We observe several buildings which are lofty enough, in the two islands that shelter it ; likewise a small fortress built a few years since by the Dutch, to secure themselves from the insults of the idolaters, who come from the inland countries ; and several spacious warehouses built by the waterside, all of which look pretty enough. But the instant the spectator is landed, all this beauty vanishes ; and he perceives nothing but a large town, built mostly of hurdles (*Palhotes*). The Dutch draw considerable revenues from Tutucurin, though they are not absolute masters of it. The whole Fishing-Coast belongs partly to the king of Madura, and the rest to the prince of Marava, who, not long since, shook off the yoke of the Maduran monarch, whose tributary he was. The Dutch attempted, some years since, to purchase, of the prince of Marava, his right to Fishing-Coast, and all the country dependent on it ; and, for this purpose, sent him a splendid embassy with magnificent presents. The prince thought fit to receive the presents, (**P. 381**) and promised fine things, but has not yet been so good as his word.

Though the Dutch are not masters of the Coast, they yet have often behaved in such a manner as if it had been entirely subject to them. Some years since they dispossessed the poor Paravas of their churches, which they turned into magazines, and lodged their factors in the houses of the missionaries. The Fathers were then forced to withdraw into the woods, and there build themselves, huts, in order that they might not abandon their flock, at a time when their presence was so necessary.

With respect to the trade carried on by the Dutch on this coast, besides the linens brought to them from Madura, and for which they barter the leather of Japan, and the spices of the Moluccas, they gain considerable advantage by two fisheries carried on here, that of pearls and that of the *Xanxus* (chank or conch). The Xanxus is a vast shell, like to those which the Tritons are represented sounding in sculpture and painting. The Dutch are surprisingly jealous of this trade, insomuch that it would cost any Indian his life, who should dare to sell one of them to any other persons but such as belong to the Dutch East India Company. They purchase them for a trifle, and send them to the kingdom of Bengal, where they are sold at a very high price. These shells are sawed in proportion to their breadth. Being round and hollow, they are wrought into bracelets, which have as bright a polish as the finest ivory. Such of them as are fished, (and that in prodigious quantities) on this coast, have their volutes from right to left. If the idolaters were to take one whose volutes are from left to right, they would consider it as a treasure worth millions ; they imagining that one of their Gods was forced to hide himself, when his enemies pursued him furiously by sea, in a Xanxus of this latter kind.

(**P. 382**) The Dutch East India Company make a second advantage by the pearl-fishey. They don't undertake the fishing on their own account, but permit every inhabitant of the country, whether Christian, Heathen, or Muhammadan, to keep as many fishing-boats as he pleases, upon condition that every boat pay the Dutch sixty crowns, and sometimes more. This duty rises to a considerable sum, six or seven hundred sometimes going upon this fishery. But all persons are not allowed to go whithersoever they please ; but certain places are allotted the several boats. Formerly the Dutch used to appoint, as early as the month of January, the time and place where the fishing was to be carried on that year, without first making any trial ; but as it was often found, that either the season of the year, or the place, was not favourable, and consequently that few oysters were taken, whence great loss accrued, as the several materials for carrying on the fishing cost considerable sums, that method was changed, and the following is observed...When the trial has been successful, and the company have given out that there will be fishing that season, the whole coast is crowded, at the time appointed, (**P. 383**) with a numberless multitude of people and boats, in which goods of every kind are brought. The Dutch Commissioners come from Colombo, capital of the island of Ceylon, to preside over the fishing. The day it is to begin, a large cannon is fired very early in the morning. That instant all the boats set out, and make for the sea, preceded by two Dutch vessels, which cast

anchor on the right and left, (**P. 384**) and then point out the limits allowed for the fishing.

(**P. 386**) ...The Dutch reserve to themselves the right of purchasing, if they think proper, the largest; but if the owner will not sell them for the price they offer, he is permitted to vend them to whomsoever he pleases. All the pearls which are fished the first day belong either to the king of Madura, or the prince of Marava, according to the road where the fishing is then carried on. The Dutch are not allowed the profits of the second day's fishing ......all those who pay ready money buying everything here exceedingly cheap.

...... Great many frauds and thefts (are) committed in the fishery in question......This coast is very sickly during the whole time of the pearl-fishery......

(**P. 387**) The fishery carried on this year, at Tutucurin, has been very unsuccessful...... As this happened but two months before my arrival at Tutucurin, it was all the town-talk; and many persons are not yet recovered from their surprise on account of so unexpected a disappointment.

......As the whole country was then up in arms, should any of our people set out, they very possibly might be robbed or murdered...... The natives had just before seized upon Father Bernard de Saa, because of his having converted a man belonging to one of their chief castes; they had dragged him (**P. 388**) before the magistrates; beat out some of his teeth, and grievously scourged his catechists......The people in general were animated against the Christians...Still I set out immediately from Tutucurin...I put off the habit usually worn by Jesuits, and assumed that of the missionaries of Madura......We unexpectedly found ourselves almost at the foot of the fortress......By a stratagem (**P. 389**) we escaped this danger...and arrived a little before day at Camien-naken-patti, where Father de Saa waited the more impatiently for me, as news had been brought the day before, that a considerable robbery had been committed upon that road through which I was to travel.

(3) *Letter of Father Peter Martin to Father Le Gabien, Aoor, in the kingdom of Madura, December* 11, 1700

(**P. 452**)......After residing near a month in Camien-naken-patti, because of the commotions which at that time infested the kingdom, whereby the roads were rendered unpassable, I set out from thence for Aoor, the principal house of the Mission of Madura.

Father Bouchet, who has the direction of that house, and to whom I am partly obliged for the favour indulged me by the Portuguese Jesuits, (I mean my being allowed to join their Mission) hearing that I was arrived on the frontiers of Madura, but at the same time was prevented from proceeding farther, because the soldiers infested the roads, sent a zealous Christian, who was perfectly well acquainted with the ways, to meet me. Accordingly I set out with this guide, who immediately led me out of the high road, into the country of the Caste of Thieves, so called, because the several individuals of it were formerly professed robbers. Though most of the people in question are turned Christians, and detest everything that has the least tendency to theft, they yet retain their former appellation; and travellers are afraid of passing through their forests. The first missionaries of Madura were so happy as to gain the esteem of that caste; so that, at this time, there is scarce any place (**P. 453**) in the kingdom, where we are better received, or live in greater security, than in their woods. Should any one among them, even of such as have not abandoned idolatry, be so rash as to pilfer even the least trifle from a Doctor of the Law of the true God, he would be punished for it in an exemplary manner. However, as natural disposition and inveterate habits are not easily rooted out, the Fathers oblige such as offer to become converts, to undergo a strict probation; but these, when once they are turned Christians, so far from robbing, or doing the least injury to any person, dissuade, to the utmost of their power, their countrymen from that and every other kind of villainy.

This Caste of Thieves are become so powerful within these few years, that they have made themselves independent, in some measure, of the king of Madura, and by that means pay him what tribute they please. Not above two years since, the caste in question, joining with a prince who pretended a right to that crown, besieged the city of Madura, formerly the capital of this kingdom, and taking it, kept it in their possession; however, they did not enjoy it long, they being less able to defend a city in form, than to make sudden attack. The moment the Talavai, by which name the prince, who now governs the kingdom under the Queen, is called, received news of the seizing of this important place, he assembled his force; set out upon his march; arrived in the night before the city; broke open one of its gates by the assistance of three or four elephants; and entered it, with part of his forces, before the enemy had time to fortify themselves, or even to draw together. Many of the Thieves were killed in the onset, and a much greater number taken prisoners. However, the rebellious prince had the good fortune to escape, and to retire

into the woods (**P. 454**) belonging to his castle, which, since that time, has been much more obedient to the government.

It was through the midst of these woods that I passed without the least danger, and travelled to Ariepaty, one of their chief towns. We formerly had a church in it, but the edifice has been since ruined, together with the fortress, which the prince of Madura demolished, after making himself master of it. . . .

(**P. 455**) I now set out again, and arrived . . . at a little village, situated between two mountains, and famous for the robberies committed in it. . . . A worthy man led me to the finest and largest Pagod (**P. 456**) I ever saw in this kingdom. It is almost fourscore foot long, and forty-eight broad; but its ceiling (**P. 457**) is not high enough, a fault we see in all the temples of India. It is supported by various pillars, carved in a good taste enough, and all of one stone. The portico, or entrance into the temple, which extends the whole breadth of it, is supported in like manner by eight stone columns, carved. The bases and capitals of these columns are in a different taste from ours, but it is no ways barbarous, and would please in Europe. There is not one window in this temple, which is built of fine free-stone. . . .

. . . the war which infested the country had obliged all the inhabitants to fly from it. . . . (**P. 458**) I, having been assured that the army would march in a few days through this city. . . .

(**P. 459**) I arrived in two days journey from thence, at Serrhine, the usual residence of one of our missionaries, but did not find him there. . . . I had the consolation to meet Father Bouchet. . . . Though I had seen this illustrious missionary before in Pondicherry, I now embraced him with fresh testimonies and respect, for his having been so instrumental in getting me received into that Mission. As he had been persecuted not above three months before, and was not quite recovered of a fit of sickness, with which he was afterwards afflicted, he looked very pale and weak. Here follows the occasion of his being persecuted.

Three catechists, forgetting their duty and the sacred character of the ministry with which they were invested, were guilty of such dissolute practices, that it was judged necessary to divest them of their employments. These wretches, instead of profiting by the sage admonitions which were given them and reforming their lives, threw off the mask, turned apostates, and resolved to ruin both the missionaries and the Mission. To succeed in their detestable design, they

brought three accusations against the Gospel-preachers. First, that they were *Pranguis*, or Europeans, an infamous set of people, who consequently must be hated by the whole nation. Secondly, that though they had been long settled in the kingdom, and had the direction and government of a great number of churches, they had never paid the least thing to the king (**P. 460**). Thirdly, that our missionaries assassinated a Friar of another order, which (they declared) had made them so odious to the Pope, that he had refused to canonize Father John de Brito, who fell a martyr to the faith in Marava. Though this was a shocking and ridiculous calumny, (the Friar whom they pretended had been assassinated being then at Surat, in his return from Rome, where His Holiness had made him a bishop) it neverthless was greatly to be feared, as the wretched apostates in question offered to give the prince twenty thousand crowns, provided he would extirpate the Christians, that they at least would prevail to get all the Gospel labourers banished the kingdom, especially Father Bouchet, against whom they had a particular spite.

This zealous missionary had first recourse to God, to implore His protection; and then, in order to prevent these pernicious designs from taking effect, he resolved to go and salute the Prince-Regent, and implore his protection. This was so bold a step, that no missionary had ever presumed to take it, lest the colour of his face should betray and discover him to be an European, the Prince above-mentioned detesting the *Pranguis* to such a degree, that, notwithstanding his being engaged in a dangerous war, he yet had dismissed from his service, not long before, some very skilful gunners (whose assistance, one would have concluded, he absolutely wanted), the moment he heard they were Europeans.

But Father Bouchet, putting his whole confidence in the Almighty, prepared his presents, went to the city, and proceeded to the palace, where he desired an audience of the prince, who, as was observed, governs under the Queen. (This princess' name is Mangamal. She had, by King Chocanada-naiken, her husband, a son, named Renga Muttu Vira Krishnappanaiken, a very promising prince, who died of the small-pox, leaving his Queen with child of a son, who is now king of Madura, under the guardianship of his grandmother.) This princess, (**P. 461**) Guardian of the Realm, educates very carefully her grandson, a prince about fourteen or fifteen years of age, to whom the kingdom belongs, she, at the same time, entrusting the Talavai, or Prince-Regent, entirely with the administration, of which he is absolute master. The Regent's conduct is so very sagacious and equitable, that he is thought to be the greatest minister that ever governed Madura.

But how disinterested soever this prince might be, yet Father Bouchet imagined it would be improper to appear before him, without observing the ceremonial of the country, that is, without making some presents. Those prepared by the missionary were of no great value, but then they were of a new kind, and all he could bestow. He had brought with him a terrestrial globe, about two-foot diameter, on which the names of the several kingdoms, provinces, coasts, and seas, were writ in the Tamul language; another globe, of glass, about nine inches diameter, cut within like looking-glasses; some multiplying and burning glasses; several Chinese curiosities sent him from Coromandel; many bracelets, of jet, adorned with silver; a cock made with shells, very neatly and skilfully wrought: to conclude, several common looking-glasses, and such curisities which they had either purchased or received as presents. The Father also concluded, that it would be necessary to obtain the favour of some courtiers, in order that they might speak in his behalf, and procure him a favourable audience; it being of the utmost importance (**P. 462**), both for the honour of religion, and the good of the church of Madura, that the Doctors of the Holy Law should be received with distinction the first time they appeared at court; a circumstance which would enforce the authority of their ministry in the minds of the common people, who obey implicitly the will and inclinations of their sovereign.

The Father having thus taken all the prudent measures he judged necessary, in order to succeed in his design, reposed the utmost confidence in God......He was not mistaken, the Talavai, or Prince-Regent, receiving him with greater honour and distinction than he could possibly have expected. The prince not only rose up the moment the Father appeared, but saluted him in the same manner as disciples here salute their masters, and the common people their lords; which is performed, by joining both hands, and then raising them to the forehead. Father Bouchet, to maintain his character, and return this favourable reception, saluted the prince as masters do their disciples, by opening his hands and stretching them towards the prince, by way of receiving him. The Regent then caused the missionary to sit down by him, on a kind of sofa, with this mark of distinction, that the sofa being too narrow for two persons to be seated conveniently upon it, the prince strained himself, made the Father sit by him, and even laid his kness on those of the Father.

(**P. 463**) A man must be as well acquainted, as we are, with the customs of this country; and the natural detestation which the natives of it, especially the *Bramins*, bear to the Europeans, to have a perfect idea of the very honourable reception which the Father met with on

this occasion. The Father himself was astonished at it, as likewise the whole court, which was vastly numerous, there being, that day, upwards of five hundred persons, the greatest part of whom were *Bramins*. The Father being thus seated, made his compliments. He then declared that he was come from the north, and from the mighty city of Rome, to instruct the inhabitants of this kingdom in the Supreme Being and in His Holy Law. That having been for several years a witness of his heroic actions, and the many victories he had gained over his enemies, he therefore was extremely desirous of seeing so great a prince, and imploring his protection in favour of his ministry. That as one of the principal Articles of the Law inculcated by him, obliged subjects to pay the strictest obedience to their sovereign, and to be inviolably attached to them, he might be assured of his fidelity, a duty which he did not fail to recommend earnestly to all his disciples.

The prince replied that the God he worshipped must be very powerful, and deserve the highest honours, (**P. 464**) since it had prompted so worthy a person to undertake so long a voyage, solely in the view of making him known to a people, who had never heard of his name. That his (the missionary's) thin pale cheeks plainly proved him to lead a very mortified life; and that the presents he brought with him plainly showed that necessity had not forced him to quit his native country. That he had already heard the most advantageous particulars concerning his learning and good sense. That as (**P. 465**) the multiplicity of his affairs would not give him leisure to understand, in the manner he could wish, the explication of the figures drawn so artfully on the globe he had brought; he therefore had sent for the most fomous astrologer in the kingdom to discourse with him upon it, in order that he might learn the uses of this wonderful machine. That perceiving, among his presents, some things which could not fail of pleasing the Queen, he therefore would leave him a moment, and go and present them to Her Majesty with his own hand. The prince then rose up, and ordered some of the courtiers to take the Father into the garden, and keep him company till his return.

The Queen, being delighted with the novelty of the presents, received them with great testimonies of joy, and commended them highly. Above all she admired the glass globe, the bracelets, and the cock wrought in shells, insomuch that she could scarce take her eyes from them. She therefore desired the Regent to thank the foreign Doctor, in her name; to pay him every kind of honour, and to comply with all his requests.

As Father Bouchet had vanished from Court, as it were, and been led into the garden, a report prevailed, in the palace and the city, that he was seized and thrown into prison. This news . . . threw the Christians into the utmost consternation. . . . However, their sorrow was soon changed into joy ; for, the prince, at his return from the Queen's appartment, reccived the Father, in preference of the whole Court, with the like honours as are paid to ambassadors, that is, he put on his head, in form of veil, a piece of gold brocade, about eight foot long, and shed over him some sweet smelling waters ; **(P. 466)** after which he declared, that he was expressly ordered by the Queen to grant him everything he desired.

Had the Father then thought proper to insinuate a word or two concerning the catechist apostates, who, for so many months, had occasioned such disturbances, and given so much scandal to his church, the prince would certainly have punished them severely, and perhaps banished them the kingdom ; but the missionary, animated with the spirt of his Lord and Master, and calling to mind that he was a Father, would not destory his children, though they had been so ungrateful and treacherous with regard to Christ and His church. He therefore contented himself with preventing, by his visitation, their doing any farther prejudice to the church, or from imposing upon the people by calumnies and horrid accusations. For this reason, after assuring the prince that he retained the deepest sense of his favours, he again begged his protection for himself and his disciples, assuring him, that they, in return for all his goodness, would daily implore the Lord of Heaven and Earth, whom they worshipped, to shower down His choicest blessings upon him, and give him the victory over his enemies. The prince promised not to forget him ; when after saluting him in the same manner as at first, he withdrew, commanding his officers to let the Father be carried through every part of the city, in the finest court-palanquin, to show the world that he honoured this foreign Doctor, and indulged him his protection.

The modesty of Father Bouchet was put to a great trial on this occasion. He debated within himself **(P. 467)** whether it was not incumbent on him to refuse the public honour now offered him ; but after pouring forth his heart before the Lord, he imagined it was necessary for His glory, and the honour of the Christian religion, that all the inhabitants of that capital should plainly see, that the prince esteemed the religion he taught; and that it would find a protector in him, when wanted. He therefore got into the palanquin; and permitted the Indians to carry him through every part of the city, with music playing before him. This pomp soon drew number-

less multitudes of people into the streets, through which he passed, they all saluting him in the most respectful manner. The Christians, who till now were afraid that their religion would be despised and censured by the prince, crowded after the missionary with acclamations and the highest demonstrations of joy, publishing aloud that they (P. 468) were Christians and disciples of the foreign Doctor. The success of this kind of triumph strengthened the neophytes in their faith, and prompted a great number of idolaters to beg to be baptized. Not satisfied with carrying Father Bouchet through the whole city of Trichirapalli; they like-wise conveyed him in this manner to the place of his abode, which is about four leagues from the capital. . . .

. . . The three apostates still continued obstinate; insomuch that the Father was forced to read publicly the sentence of excommunication . . . . This was the first instance of such a kind of severity practised in those countries. . . . (P. 469) . . . Unable to bear these taunts (of the people) any longer, after continuing six months in a state of rebellion, two of them came and threw themselves at the Father's feet . . . and were again admitted into the number of the Faithful. As for the third, he persevered in his apostacy . . .

Though this affair ended happily, yet the fatigues Father Bouchet had undergone on this occasion threw him into a fit of sickness, from which he was not well recovered, when I found him in Serrhine. We stayed there but one day, and the next went to Aoor, which is but a short day's journey from thence. When Father Bouchet first came into the Mission of Madura, about twelve years ago, the missionaries were under such fears, that they never entered the villages except at night; but ...things are much altered for the better since that time. For we not only went into Aoor in open day; but the Christians of the neighbouring towns assembling together, received us with music and acclamations, a circumstance which drew tears of joy from my eyes...

(P. 470)...Aoor is certainly the most considerable Mission now in Madura, not only on account of its neighbourhood to the capital of the kimgdom, but also because there are twenty-nine churches dependent on it, in which are computed upwards of thirty thousand Christians ...Now there are four churches for the higher castes...Though these... are built only of earth, and covered with straw, they yet are neat and finely embellished, and adorned within. But we earnestly wish to have one church (at least) of stone (P. 471) which may be equal to, or if possible surpass, the idol temples; but this can never happen except it please God to prompt some generous person in Europe to

furnish us with monies for that purpose. Such a building would contribute greatly to the advancement of our religion, if we may form a judgment of this matter from the success we met with in Aoor.

At Father Bouchet's arrival there, it was a poor little village... ...it is now become one of the most considerable towns in the kingdom...

(P. 473)...We have frequent alarms, and are daily exposed to new persecutions. Since the little time that I have lived in Aoor, we were thrice going to fly, and live in the woods whither our most valuable things, that is, the church ornaments and our books, had been carried before.

(P. 475)...Correspondence, by way of letter, this being rare, and very difficult to be carried on, for fear we should discover ourselves to be Europeans, or raise some suspicion in the natives, were they to know that we have any concerns with the Portuguese, and other Europeans of the Coast; and, by that means, cause us to be persecuted, as has happened more than once.

Chirangam is an island formed by the river Caveri, opposite to the city of Tricherapali, capital of the kingdom. It is one of the most famous places in all India. In it stands a temple surrounded with seven walls; and it is considered as the most holy temple in these parts ..It is but a few years since the Christian religion began to take root in this island, and that Father Bouchet built a little church in it ...The priests of the neighbouring temple have frequently endeavoured to burn this little edifice...

About a year and a half ago, Father Simon Carvalho had the grief to see a fine church, built by him a little before demolished. It stood between the city of Tanjaour, and a famous idol temple... (P. 476). In pulling down the church in question they were protected by a minister of state, whom they had bribed.

Some time after, Father Bouchet, who was in Tricherapali, sent to invite me to go and spend some days with him. A few years since it was extremely difficult for the Fathers to get into that great city, and they were under perpetual apprehensions all the time they continued there; but ever since the prince has indulged Father Bouchet his protection, as was before observed, we go thither publicly in the day-time; ever since which the guards who are posted at the gates, so far from molesting us, salute us very respectfully. I

procceeded forward towards Father Bouchet's, and by that means had an opportunity of seeing a great part of the city, which appeared vastly populous, but ill-built, most of the houses being of earth, and covered with straw. It is not but there are persons rich enough, to raise strong handsome houses; but either covetousness, or the fears are under of being thought rich, will not permit them to build these in a neater or more commodious manner. I found Father Bouchet in perfect health, and had the consolation to find a great number of zealous and fervent Christians with him.

(P. 477.) At one of the extremities of Tricherapali, stands a church which Father Bouchet built on the ruins of a Pagod. The spot on which it is raised had formerly been given to the chief missionaries of Madura; but a war breaking out, as frequently happens in these countries, the Fathers were obliged to leave the city, and fly and conceal themselves in the woods. During their absence, an idolater seized upon the ground, and built a small temple upon it, which he filled with Pagods of all sizes. It is not many years since Father Bouchet was restored to the possession of that spot, on which occasion he obliged the priest of the idols to quit it. It was a spectacle very glorious to our religion, and the same time worthy of compassion, to see the needless pains, which the poor idol-priest in question took, whilst he was removing his gods. The Christians were urgent with him to quit the place; and, to make the greater despatch they themselves took the idols, and set them upon the ground with no great ceremony. By this means several were broken, on which occasion he himself would gather up the scattered fragments; weeping at the same time bitterly, but not daring to complain, since he only was forced out of a place which did not belong to, and had been usurped by, him. The temple was pulled down, and on its ruins church was built (P. 478) with a little house, which is the residence of the missionaries.

VOLUME II

(4) *Letter of Father Martin to Father De Villette, Aoor,* 1701

(P. 282)......The evening before Ash Wednesday, I set out from Cormandel to go to my destined Mission. About midnight my disciples and I got to the bank of a river which we were to cross over; the night being exceedingly dark, we wandered into a part of the river, which was so very deep that we were up to the chin in water...

Such missionaries as travel from the coasts inhabited by the Europeans are obliged to set out in night to prevent their being seen

by the Heathens, who would reproach them with being *Pranguis* or Europeans; a circumstance which would make us contemptible in their eyes, and raise in them an insurmountable aversion to our religion.

After travelling some time, I spent the remainder of the night in a ruined house, standing at the entrance of a village. The cold which seized me, as I crosed the river, threw me into a fever, which very much alarmed the Christians, my companions. I wanted a little fire to be lighted; but we did not dare to make any, for fear of drawing the Heathens to our hut, as they thereby would have discovered me to be an European. For this reason, I set out again two hours before day and travelled a considerable way, which fatigued me prodigiously.

(P. 283)…….About evening four or five persons appeared at our right and were advancing towards us as fast as possible. As this whole country is infested with thieves, we thought of nothing but an attack; but our fears were soon removed, the people being Christians, who were making the utmost haste, only to beseech me to prepare for death a Christian woman who was expiring ..It would have been dangerous to enter the village, as the greatest part of its inhabitants were idolaters and enemies to the Christian name...Preparing her for death, I continued my journey towards Coottour.

I arrived thither about noon, and found a Portuguese Jesuit Father Bertholdi, who labours in that Mission with a zeal much superior to his natural strength……(P. 284). This is a danger (cobras—*Nalla Pomboo*) we were often exposed to, in the Mission of Madura.

(P. 285) I stayed but half a day in Coottour, and set out from, thence next day. I passed through the settlement, where two months before, in my journey to Pondicheri, I had baptized two children and a grown person who was dying. Four or five of the most fervent converts in this settlement accompanied me to another (colony) called Kokeri in its neighbourhood.

As I was extremely desirous of arriving with all the diligence possible at Coonampaty, the seat of my new Mission, I left Father Dias much sooner than I would willingly have done. I made such haste that I arrived pretty early next day on the banks of the Coloran which, at certain seasons of the year, is one of the largest and most rapid rivers that can be seen; but at others, sinks to almost

a brook. When I crossed it, the only discourse was on the famous victory the Talavai (the Prince or Governor-General of Trichinopoly) had gained just before over the king of Tanjour's forces, and which had like to have proved the disgrace of that prince's first minister, one of the most cruel persecutors of our holy religion. The following particulars were told me on that occasion. The expedients which this minister employed, in order to save himself will inform you of his character, and what we may justly fear from so artful an enemy.

(P. 286) The Talavai was encamped on the north shore of the river to secure his kingdom from the army of Tanjaour, which made dreadful havoc in every part of the country; but all this efforts could not check the incursions of an enemy whose cavalry was much more numerous than his. He therefore imagined that the safest course would be to make a diversion; whereupon he resolved to cross the river, whose waters were very much fallen, and carried terror even to the kingdom of Tanjaour. This he did so secretly that the enemies did not know of his crossing till they saw his troops spread on the other side of the river, and going to pierce into the heart of the kingdom, which was defenceless. This unexpected crossing quite disconcerted the army of Tanjaour, whose only refuge was to cross the river also, to defend their country. This they resolved, but unhappily made an ill-choice of the ford; not to mention that the rains, which were lately fallen on the mountains of Malabar, where the source of that river lies, had swelled it to such a degree at the time that the army of Tanjaour was attempting to cross, that several, both horse and foot, were carried away by the stream. The Talavai observing the disorder they were in, fell upon them and easily broke them. This was not so much a battle as a flight, and the whole army of Tanjaour was routed. After this complete victory, the greatest part of the kingdom of Tanjaour was laid waste.

The king, exasperated at his being overcome by a nation, who were accustomed to submit, very much suspected his Prime Minister Balogi, or as others term him Vagogi-Pandiden, either of negligence or treachery. The grandees, who hated him, had vowed his destruction ; and declared that the ill-success of this war was entirely to him. But Balogi, fearless of the machinations which were (P. 287) carrying on against him, waited secretly upon the king. 'My liege,' says he, with an undaunted tone of voice, 'I will voluntarily surrender myself in order to have my head chopped off, if in a week I don't conclude a peace with your enemy.' (*Lit.*—'I myself will bring my head upon a scaffold'). The time he desired was very short and the king indulged it.

Immediately this subtle minister sent his secretaries to the principal traders of the city and places adjacent, commanding every one of them to lend him a considerable sum of money, upon pain of forfeiting all their possessions. He drew whatever sums he could from his relations and friends; and even took a large sum of money which ought to have been put into the king's treasury. Finally, in less than four days, he amassed near 500,000 crowns, which he instantly employed in order to win over the Queen of Ticherapaly; to bribe most of the members of her council; and, above all, to gain the Talavai's father, a man who loved money inordinately. He managed matters so dexterously that, before the week was expired, a peace was concluded (even without the privity of the Talavai) in Ticherapaly with the king of Tanjaour. Thus the vanquished prince gave law to the victor, and the minister regained his monarch's favour, by which means his power became more absolute than ever. The only use he afterwasds made of it was to ruin most of the grandees, and make the Chrstians suffer a cruel persecution.

......I at last arrived, after a variety of fatigues, at Coonampaty, formerly one of the most flourishing churches of the Mission, but now almost ruined by (**P. 288**) the different contests and perpetual wars of the lords who inhabit these forests. This church, for three years, has been superintended by Father Carvalho, who, notwithstanding his ill-health, reaps an extraordinary harvest.

The little rain which fell the year before, the violent heat felt in March, and the multitude of Christians who come to Coonampaty had drained a great part of the pond which is the only place were these people can be furnished with water. For this reason I resolved to go to Elacoorrichy, but was prevented by a persecution then raised against the Christians of Cottoor......

The persecution which broke out against the Christians of Cottoor detained me in Coonampaty......

(**P. 289**) ...But now the reservoir of Coonampaty being entirely drained, I resolved to retire to Elacoorrichy; but thought to travel, first to Aour in order to (**P. 290**) confer with the missionaries, on certain particulars which gave me some uneasiness. . . .

(**P. 293**) I set out from thence for Elacoorrichy. In this journey the first settlement I came to in this country is Nandavanapaty, where formerly was a very beautiful church, and a flourishing colony of Christians. The church was destroyed during the war, but not all the Christians......

After travelling some days in the forests, I arrived at the banks of the Coloran which I crossed with no great difficulty. I afterwards travelled by the riverside and came to a small wood ... (P. 294). I travelled forward still along the banks of the Coloran, and arrived about noon at Elacoorrichy.

The very evening of my arrival, a messenger brought word from Coottoor (in French Couttour) that Father Bertholdi was very ill there of a violent defluxion which was fallen on his eyes and ears, occasioned by the hardships he had suffered during a month's imprisonment. I set out instantly to give him all the assistance in my power. It was a very beautiful moonlight night; but we were obliged to travel continually through woods; and my guides mistook the way so often that I did not reach Coottoor before morning...... (P. 295)......I came very seasonably to his aid......In three day's time he was quite freed from all pains. As he no longer wanted my assistance, I resolved to return to Elacoorrichy where my presence was necessary......

I passed through several villages, of which these forests are full, but had the grief to find that the name of the Lord was quite unknown in them, for want of catechists......(P. 296) there are fourteen in my district, whereas fifty would not be sufficient.

(P. 297) There was scarce one Christian Chootre (Shootre) or honourable family in Elacoorrichy, nor in any of the adjacent (P. 298) settlements, which consisted almost wholly of Parias......No circumstance contributes more to defeat our endeavours with regard to the higher castes than the ideas of Parianism annexed by them to our holy religion. The harvest was abundant in another settlement about a league westward from Elacoorrichy.

The Nababe (The General and Governor of a Province) of Carnata, which had been conquered by the Great Mogul, resolved to extort, by violent methods, the tribute which the Chilianekan refused to pay. Immediately a rumour prevailed that the Mogul's forces were already entered into the territories of the prince of Arieloor, brother to the prince of Elacoorrichy. Our Christians were seized with a panic and dispersed in an instant...... (P. 299)..........Some even without saying a word to me were taking down the church ornaments and carrying them to the most solitary part of the forest.......all flying from the settlement with the utmost speed......The very next day I sent to inform all those Christians who had fled across the Coloran that there was no manner of danger, upon which they all flocked to my church.

I was still in Elacoorrichy, about the middle of May, the season when the winds begin to blow exceedingly hard. They then are violent and raise such thick clouds of dust as darken the sun, and sometimes hide it from us four or five days......At this time it is scarce possible for any one to go westward **(P. 300)** whence the storm comes......

These high winds are the forerunners of the abundant rains which fall on the Western Coast of India, and on the mountains of Malabar ; and they give rise to the Coloran which flows throughout the kingdoms of Maissoor, Madura, Tanjaour and Choren-Mandalam, and gives them fertility. The Indians expect these rains as impatiently as the Egyptians did the inundation of the Nile.

It was thought the river would rise that year before the ordinary season, because the winds had begun to blow much earlier than the preceding years. My design was to set out from Elacoorrichy the instant the waters should appear in the river, in order to travel southward into a province where neither missionary nor catechist were ever seen. But it was to no purpose the winds blew, the river continuing still dry so that the inhabitants dreaded a general famine.

Nevertheless, the rains had fallen in the usual season; and the waters which rush from the mountains would have entered the Coloran sooner than ordinary, had not the king of Maissoor stopped their course by a prodigious mole he raised and which extended the whole breadth of the cannal. His design was to turn off the waters by the bank in order that these flowing into the canals dug by him might refresh his dominions. But while he thus resolved to make his own lands fruitful and thereby increase his revenues, he was going to ruin the two neighbouring kingdoms, those of Madura and Tanjaour. The waters would not have begun to rise there before the end of July, and the canal would have been dry by the middle of September.

(P. 301) The two princes, zealous for the welfare of their respective kingdoms, were exasperated at this attempt; upon which they united against the common enemy in order to oblige him, by force of arms, to destroy a mole which did them such vast prejudice. They were making great preparations for this purpose when the river Coloran revenged (as was the phrase here) the affront which had been put upon its waters, by captivating them in the manner the prince in question had done. During the time the rains descended but moderately on the mountains, the mole stood, and the waters flowed gently into the canals dug for that purpose ; but the instant

they fell abundantly, the river swelled to such a degree that it broke the mole and dragged it impetuously along. In this manner the prince of Maissoor, after putting himself to a great expense, was frustrated, in an instant, of the immense riches which he had hoped to gain.

It was not long before the channel was full, which gave the inhabitants the greater joy as they expected an absolute famine......

The Coloran being still fordable, I crossed it with all diligence possible to get to Coonampaty; and there wait a favourable opportunity of travelling to Tanjour. The Christian faith is cruelly persecuted in this kingdom. . . .

(5) *Letter of Father Martin to Father De Villette.*
Marava, in the Mission—Madura, 8th November 1709.

(P. 408) It is now going of ten years that I have been endeavouring to plant the Christian religion in Madura. The harvest has been exceedingly abundant this year, and my sufferings greater; and indeed, the soil is very fruitful in such. Marava is a great kingdom, tributary to that of Madura. However, the monarch who governs it is only nominally so; his troops being sufficient to make head agaist those of the king of Madura, should the latter pretend to claim the tribute by force of arms. The king of Marava reigns with absolute sway, and several princes are subject to him, all whom he dispossesses of their dominions at pleasure.

The king of Marava is the only prince among all those reigning in the wide-extended Mission of Madura, who has shed the blood of the missionaries. Famine and diseases have made dreadful havoc in this country, a circumstance which very much increased my toils; the number of the sick and dying being so great that I had scarce a moment's rest.

Nothing is more common than robberies and murders especially in the district. . . . .

(P. 409) I set out next day for another place where my presence was more necessary. Immediately after my arrival, my hut and the little church were surrounded by fifteen thieves . . . .

I could stay with them but two days, being wanted in a country at a considerable distance from that in question, a great number of whose inhabitants were sick . . . .

(**P. 410**) I therefore set out with the design of advancing still farther into the Country of the Robbers ; for so the quarter is called which I am now visiting . . . . .

. . . It is certain these Indians observe the law of retaliation very strictly. If there happens to be a quarrel, and one of the parties pulls his own eye out, or is guilty of suicide, the other party must inflict the like panishment upon himself, or on some of his relations . . . .

(**P. 411**) This cruelty extends to their own children.

(**P. 413**) . . . . These robbers are absolute masters of this whole country, and pay no kind of tribute or tax to the prince. They come out of their forests every night, being about five or six hundred in number, and then go and plunder the habitations or villages subject to him. His endeavours to check them have hitherto proved ineffectual. About five or six years since, he marched out all his troops to oppose them, and advanced as far as their forests ; when making a great havoc of these rebels he built a fortress, in which he left a strong garrison to curb them. However, they soon shook off his yoke ; for, assembling together about a year after the expedition in question, they took the fortress by surprise, razed it, put all the garrison to the sword, and possessed themselves of the whole country.

From that time they have been the terror of the whole district. (**P. 414**) It is said that these wretches have laid waste upwards of five hundred considerable settlements this year.

Though it is scarce possible for the Christian faith to spread very much in a country where such detestable customs prevail, I yet have converted a considerable number of the natives, particularly in *Velleoor*, signifying in the Indian language, the White Settlement...... Within these few years, war, famine, and sickness have made dreadful havoc in every part of this country. . . .

APPENDIX C

John Nieuhoff, Voyages and Travels into Brasil and East Indies

VOLUME II

(P. 265) To the east, it (the kingdom of Travankoor) borders upon the kingdom of Madura . . . . Kalkolang is a very large city... upon the confines of the Nayk[1] of Madure. (It) is the chief residence of the king who constantly keeps a garrison of ten thousand Negros (Nāyars) here, to secure it against the Nayk of Madure, whose power is much dreaded here.

......The king (of Travankoor) is by some styled the Great King, because he possesses larger territories than any other of the Malabar kings. He is served in great state and maintains abundance of commanders whom they call *Mandigals* and many councillors called *Pullas* (*Eṭṭuviṭṭil Piḷḷamār*). Some ascribe to him a superiority over neighbouring princes, but of this I am convinced to the contrary by my own experience ; it is true they reverence him as a potent king, but pay him no obedience. Others will have him to be a vassal of the king of Narasingha.

The Seven Sea-ports of Madure

1. Toutekoriin (Tuticorin), the chief among the sea-ports of the coast of Madure ; others are—2. Mannapara, 3. Alendale, 4. Wiranypatnam, 5. Pommekiel, 6. Baypaer or Vaypaer, and 7. Bempaer. All these villages are adorned with stately churches, built by the Portuguese, especially those of Mannapara and Bempaer ; bus are now in a decaying condition since the Portuguese have been chased thence. Some of the Romish priests now and then come to say Mass in the neighbouring villages, whither the people flock in great numbers, though, to speak truth, they are more Heathens than Christians. Toutekoriin consumes yearly abundance of foreign

[1] The word Nāyak is spelt sometimes Nayk and frequently Neyk; the former form, however, is retained here throughout.

commodities, by reason of the great numbers of inhabitants living along this coast, who must be provided from abroad with most things they stand in need of. Toutekoriin is an open place but beautified with stately stone buildings. It has three large churches built by the Portuguese, which are to be seen at a great distance at sea, the country round about being flat and low. In one of these the Reformed exercise their religious worship, besides which the convent of the Franciscans is lately fitted up for the same use.

(**P. 294**) The Dutch East India Company have a factory here, managed by a merchant as Chief Governor ; by a factor as his Deputy ; two or three Assistants and a Military Officer under whose command are some soldiers, but the Nayk of Madure will not allow them to erect any fortifications. During my stay here, I began to erect a brick-wall round the garden, but finding the Jentyves to look with a jealous eye upon it, I desisted ; yet I took care to repair the house of the Company and set their flag on the top of it which might be seen a good way at sea.

This place was taken by the Dutch from the Portuguese (in 1658) without much resistance. In the road of Toutekoriin is good anchorage at five fathom water in a sandy bottom.

Three small leagues from Toutekoriin near the rocks of Remanakor, not far from the kingdom of Narasingha, lies the village of Punikael, where the Portuguese formerly had a fort and a garrison of forty men. Two leagues from thence there was a Pagan temple of the Bramens called Trichanduri, against which and the priests thereof the Portuguese would frequently utter very injurious words, which so exasperated the inhabitants that they entered into a league with their neighbours, viz., the Badagas of Narasingha, in order to drive the Cristians thence. Accordingly, having with a great deal of secrecy, got together a body of 6,000 men and received certain intelligence that the Portuguese in the fort were but ill provided with gun-powder (the chief terror of these barbarians) they marched directly to Punikael. The Portuguese, being not a little surprised at so unexpected a fight, were put to the greatest nonplus, that could be, being in want of ammunition, and no great account being to be made upon the Parvas (the Christian inhabitants) as being not trained up to military affairs, but living upon fishing and swimming. These being sensible of their inability to resist the enemy, no sooner heard o, his approach, but they began to betake themselves with their movables to their boats, which lay near the shore, which the Badagas endeavouring to prevent, some retired to unpassable places, others to the sea-side, whilst others were exposed to the mercy of the enemy,

and, with most dreadful outcries, implored the assistance of the Portuguese in the fort. (Anthony Kriminalis showed much bravery in rescuing the Parvas, but he was murdered by the Badagas, among whom there were Muhammadans also.)

Not far from Punikael or Pommekael lies a great village called Putanam and so further up the coast Bembar or Bempaer, Kalekure, Beadal, Nianankor or rather Remanakoris, and Kanhameira. Next you see Negapatam, the first frontier of the coast of Coromandel, but one of the chiefest towns of this coast is Periapatan, situated near the rocks of Romananankoris, being the capital city of the Maravas (**P. 295**) who inhabit the mountains, a barbarous generation living only upon robbing. The Jesuits that formerly belonged to the church of Periapatan did endeavour to reclaim them in some measure from their barbarity, but most of them soon returned to their old way of living. There is another village seated on the other side of the rocks of Romananankoris, directly opposite to Negapatam, the inhabitants of which are all Christians. All along the sea-coast are about thirty villages, among which, besides the before mentioned, are the chiefest; Trichandar or Trekandar, Katlegrande and Cherakalle.

Manners and Customs

The inhabitants of those places are very black and strong. They are deceitful and cunning, make but little account of their wives, but generally keep two or three harlots, by whom they have sometimes sixteen or eighteen children. The men wear nothing but a single piece of calico, wrapt about their middle, and another piece about their head which they call *Romare*. The ordinary women commonly wear painted calico, those of fashion are adorned with gold rings and bracelets when they are abroad, but are very nasty at home. They tie their hair up in a truss behind like those of Malabar, for the rest they have good features. They live upon meat and rice, but drink nothing but water, which they are fain to fetch half a league from the sea-shore. They live by pearl-fishing and catching of fish, by weaving and shipping, there being some who drive a considerable trade with the painted calicos, to Kalpentien, Kolamba, and the Malabar coast. They have abundance of calico and linen weavers here, and great numbers of people are employed in painting of calicos, which they do very artificially. This trade was in great request whilst I was here, because I used to give all imaginable encouragement to them.

Government

The inhabitants are geverned by judges of their own, who are chosen every year by the Chief Director of the Dutch Company

there, whom they style the Captain of the Seven Sea-ports. Each village has the privilege to propose four, out of which the Captain chooses two, who swear fealty to the Company; all civil causes are transacted in their respective villages. but criminal matters are decided at Toutekoriin in the Council of Nine, whereof the Captain is President. The remaining Portuguese pay no taxes to the Dutch Company, but to the Nayk of Madure; however, this tax is paid with the approbation of the Chief Director, who allots everyone his share according to his substance. Those who are backward in their payment must expect speedy execution, which is done by the soldiers of the Nayk and causes frequent quarrels betwixt the inhabitants and the soldiers as it happened in my time. Then, the Nayk peremptorily demanding the tax from the Parvas, which they were not able to pay, I sent to him a sergeant with some soldiers, to desire that he would send a commissioner, with whom they might treat, and obtain some time for the payment thereof, upon which the Nayk having sent one of his great officers with a body of horse, I remonstrated to him the impossibility of the matter, telling him that the seven sea-ports were willing to make a present of two silver dishes filled with ducats to his master, which was well accounted of, and the Nayk as a token of his satisfaction, sent me a scarf richly embroidered with gold. These seven sea-ports were formerly (before the Portuguese fleets appeared in these parts) under the government of the King of Marten, a vassal of the Queen of Tengausy, unto whom they were forced to pay many taxes; at which time the Parvas lived deeper in the country, and used to serve in the wars to such princes as would pay them best.

One time a certain Parvas happening to fall out with some Moors, these cut off his nose and ears, which so exasperared the Parvas that they resolved to take up arms and to revenge the quarrel of their countrymen. To begin the fray they took one of the Moorish merchants prisoners; whose nose and ears they likewise cut off and so sent him home. Hereupon the Moors having assembled a body of 30,000 men, they marched to and pitched their tents near Toutekoriin. On the other hand, the Parvas were not above 5,000 men and well armed, and trusting more to their bravery than number, fell upon the Moors so courageously, that they made them quit the field, with the slaughter of 7,000 of their men, a great number of them being forced to the sea-shore, saved themselves in boats, but were scarce got to sea when, by a strong tempest from the South-West, they were so dispersed that no news was ever heard of them since. After this **(P. 296)** victory the Parvas, having made themselves masters of these sea-ports, came to a composition with the Queen, promising to pay her the same taxes as the Moors had done, which being impossible for them to perform, this proved the occasion of unspeak-

able miseries; some of them being imprisoned, for want of payment, others sold for slaves to that degree that at last they resolved to shake off the yoke, cost it what it would. The Portuguese who (in) 1490 appeared first thereabouts with their ships from Cochin, having at that time traded there for forty years before and consequently their strength at sea being not unknown to the Parvas, they sent their deputies to Cochin to implore their protection and to promise their obedience and that they were ready to embrace the Christian faith. The Portuguese willing to improve this opportunity came with their fleet (in) 1533 on that coast, and having made themselvs masters of the sea-port towns, the Parvas received baptism all on one day. However, they met with great opposition afterwards from those on the coasts of Coromandel and Malabar, encouraged underhand by the Parvas, till at last matters were adjusted thus, that the Portuguese should remain masters of the coast, that the Parvas should pay them a certain annual tribute, according to their ability, and that all the chief men of that coast should have their share in the pearl-fishing, which was to be performed on a certain day. After all, the Nayk of Madura, having found means to get into the possession of this country, left the Portuguese in the full possession of their jurisdiction over the Parvas, and of the free exercise of their religion in which state it continued till the year 1630, when the King of Portugal having sent thither a governor to clip the wings of the Romish clergy, who were grown too powerful there, this occasioned new troubles. For the Parvas being a zealous kind of people and for the most part at the devotion of the priests, they were divided into two factions, during which intestine commotions the clergy did not forget to improve their authority and to enrich themselves at the expense of their flock, but the Jentyves or Pagans also began to increase to such a degree, that being become formidable to the Parvas they often forced them to shelter themselves against their forces in the nighbouring islands. Since that time the Parvas acknowledged the jurisdiction of the Portuguese governor. Each village has two judges who are changed every year; they keep courts twice a week, and in conjunction with the *Petangiins* (who are hereditary officers) decide all controversies of less moment. They raise the taxes and are accountable once a year to the people for all their transactions. Whilst the Portuguese were masters here, the Jentyves durst not exact more taxes from the Parvas than was agreed for, unless they would see them go with wife and children to the neighbouring islands, from whence they did not return till they had obtained some considerable abatement. But of late years the Parvas having left off that custom, the Jentyves improve it to their advantage, and force them to pay three times as much as they used to do formerly.

The kingdom of the Nayk of Madure, under whose jurisdiction the seven before-mentioned sea-ports are, borders to the west upon the kingdom of Travankoor, to the east upon the sea, and to the north-west upon the country of the Nayk of Tanjaor or Tanjauwer, betwixt the coast of Malabar near the Cape Comorin and Coromandel; its whole extent being along the whole eastern gulf or coast opposite to Ceylon from the Cape Comorin (where the coast of Malabar ends) to the town of Bempaer or the river Ulton, a tract of seventy-five leagues in length and thirty in breadth. The sea-shore, commonly called the Pearl-Coast from the many pearl banks that are hereabouts, extends from south to north in length, and in some places about half a league deep into the country. The capital city and ordinary residence of the Nayk is Madure, five days' journey to the north of Koylang; being adorned with many magnificent *pagodes* or pagan temples, which have very high turrets gilt on the top. Along the coast of Madure neither grass or herb or plant is to be seen except thistles and house-leek; it having been found by experience that the coco trees would not thrive here no more than several other Indian trees. Notwithstanding which, they are sufficiently provided with all manner of necessaries from the circumjacent country, as well as from abroad by way of Toutekoriin. The sea-shore abounds in hares and partridges, the first of which resemble our rabbits, their flesh being tough, yet in taste (**P. 297**) like our hares. The flesh of the partridge, which have red legs and round bills here, is of an agreeable taste. They have here mice as big as cats .....which fight and bite like dogs......They will dig underneath the doors and do considerable mischief to the merchandise in the warehouses. This country also produces serpents and divers other sorts of venomous creatures. In October, November and December, the western winds blow with such violence the sand from the adjacent mountains to the shore, that you are not able to open your eyes. Much rain falls deeper in the country, and near the Cape Comorin, but never at Toutekoriin, instead of which a thaw falls every night, which is very cold......The winds sometimes (blow) as if out of a fiery furance.

The Nayk of the kingdom of Madure is master of several considerable countries, each of which are governed by a peculiar Governor, besides which there is one Governor-General, who has the chief management of the whole kingdom; who ruled all our time the country was called *Boomalapalles.* Besides the Governors, each village has two judges, who are much respected by the inhabitants. The Nayk, to secure himself of the fidelity of his Governors, detains always their wives and children in a certain castle called Zwela Baddy, about seven leagues from Madure, under the guard of 300 eunuchs; neither are the husbands permitted to see them without

peculiar licence from the Nayk, and are obliged to depart again in two or three days. Some to avoid this inconvenience content themselves with harlots. Most of the inhabitants of the country of Madure are Jentyves (by some they are called Badagas) though some of them have been converted to the Romish faith by the Portuguese. The Jentyves are accounted good soldiers, yet are much inferior to the Malabars; witness, the wars the Nayk of Tanigos, though much inferior in power, wages against them.

There are three Nayks in this part of the Indies, viz., the Nayk of Madure, the Nayk of Tanjaor, by the Dutch called Tanjouwer and sometimes Teaver, and the Nayk of Gingi, otherwise called Chengier. The word Nayk, Neyk or Najeka signifies as much as a governor, vassal or viceroy, their predecessors having in ancient times been only governors of those countries they are now possessed of, under the jurisdiction of the kings of Vidia Najar, Bisnagar or Narasingha; but having revolted against their liege-lord, each of them assumed the royal power and title. The Nayk of Madure had been for a considerable time in war with the Nayk of Tanjaor and taken many places from him; at my time the war was renewed with more vigour than ever; and the Nayk of Tanjaor having gathered a great army attacked the Nayk of Madure so briskly that he took from him in a few days all the places he had conquered from him before. The army of the Nayk of Madure being much dishertened by the victories of their enemies, the Madure sent to me to Koylang his chief governor desiring assistance from the Company; but, as it was not our interest to engage on any side, I excused it as handsomely as I could.

APPENDIX D

Inscriptions Chronologically Arranged.

N. B.—The equated A. D. dates, on which this chronological arrangement is based, are those of the Madras Department of Epigraphy and of the other publications referred to, unless otherwise indicated.

1. 1475.—Tamil; Manmatha, Dhanus; Chidambaram; gift by purchase of some godowns by a certain Nāgama Nāyaka. (331 of 1913,)

2. 1482.—Tamil; Śubhakrit; Tiṭṭaguḍi (Vriddhāchalam, South Arcot); a dispute between two factions in the village which lasted for several years and was settled by the agent of Nāgama Nāyaka. (6 of 1903.)

3. 1483.—Grantha and Tamil; Ś.S. 1404 expired, Śubhakrit current; Virinchipuram (Vellore, North Arcot), Sāḷuva Narasimhadēva; gift to the deity by Nāgama Nāyaka. (48 of 1887; *South Indian Inscriptions*, I, p. 132, No. 119.)

4. 1484.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1406, Saumya (1489); Tirukkachchūr (Chingleput); Na(ra)singarāya; foundation of a village by a private individual for the merit of the king, and Nāgama Nāyaka, the foremost of his servants (*Mudarppāvāḍai?*); tax on *Kaikkōḷars* and other weavers, and on other professional classes in the village (quarter *paṇam* per month on each loom). (318 of 1909; *M. E. R.*, 1910, p. 113.)

5. 1518.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1440, Īśvara; Tirupullāṇi—Darbhaśayanam—(Ramnad); a damaged record of Mahābali Vāṇādarāya Nāyakkar. (113 of 1903.)

6. 1519.—Granta; Ś. S. 1441, Pramāthin; Ānaimalai (Madura); Krishṇa Rāya; mentions a certain Madhura-Rāmanātha as his agent, and Timmabhūpa as his door-keeper. (455 of 1906.)

7. 1528.—Tamil; Ś.S. 14(66), (Vija)ya (1533), Tirupullāṇi; a damaged record of Sundarattōḷuḍaiyār Mahāvali-Vāṇādarāyar. (109 of 1903).

8. 1530.—Tamil; Ś S. 1452, Manmatha (1535); Kāḷaiyārkōvil (Śivaganga, Ramnad): gift of land by Sundarattōḷuḍaiyār Māvali-Vāṇādarāyar. (585 of 1902.)

9. 1532.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1454, Hēviḷambi (1537); Kāḷaiyārkōvil; gift of land by Māvali-Vāṇādarāyar. (587 of 1902.)

10. 1532.—K. Ā. 707; Tirukāḷūr (Śrīvaikunṭham, Tinnevelly); Mārttāṇḍa Varman; his grant to the temple. (Sewell, I, pp. 313-4.)

11. 1533.—Tamil; Ś. S. 145 (5), Manmatha (1535); Dēvipaṭṭaṇam (Ramnad); an incomplete record of Sundarattōḷuḍaiya Mahābali-Vāṇādarāyar. (121 of 1903.)

12. 1533.—Ś. S. 1455, Śōbhagrit, Makara, New Moon Day (1543); Madura; a private document drawn up between two brothers after a dispute as to who was the elder. The younger, Śinna Vaḍāvāḍa Tummiśi Nayakkar, having been declared in an assembly consisting of 18 Kōḍangi Nāyakkars and Polegars that he was junior, the elder Rāmarāya Tummiśi Nāyakkar granted him some lands. He calls himself the head of Śillavārs, and assumes great titles as the king of Vanga, etc. (*S. C. P.*, No. 27; Burgess, pp. 107-8, No. 20.)

13. 1535.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1457 expired, Parābhava (1546); Kaḷakkāḍu (Nāngunēri, Tinnevelly): (Sa)dāśivadeva-Mahārāya; mentions Rāmappa Nāyaka, the agent of Viṭṭhaladēva. The king is said to have conquered the Musalmans, subdued all countries, and levied tribute from Ceylon. (129 of 1905; *M. E. R.*, 1905, p. 60.)

14. 1535.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1457, Jaya; Tiruppattūr (Ramnad); Vīrapratāpa A(chyu)tadēva-Mahārāya; his gift of the village of Varaguṇaputtūr for the merit of Viśvanātha Nāyakkar, the son of Nāgama Nāyakkar, and an officer of the king. (113 of 1908, *M. E. R.* 1909, p. 119.)

15. 1535.—Grantha and Tamil; Ś. S. 1457, Manmatha: Tenkāśi (Śankaranāyinārkōvil, Tinnevelly); Pāṇḍya Jaṭilavarman *alias* Perumāl Kulaśekharadēva Irandakālameḍutta, who 'revived the old time', with the usual

birudas of the later Pāṇḍyas; his damaged record of gift of land. (525 of 1909.)

16. 1537—Tamil, Ś. S. 1459 expired, K. Ā. 71 (3), Hēmalamba; Tirukkurunguḍi (Nānguṇēri, Tinnevelly); Virapratāpa Sadāśiva Mahārāja; gift of the village of Puḷiyūrkkurichchi in Nāṭṭāttuppōkku, a district of the Tiruvaḍidēśam, by the son of Aṇṇan Basavaṇṇa Nāyakkar who was an officer of the *Mahāmanḍalēśvara* Rājādhirāja Viṭṭilarāja. (6 of Appendix A, 1906.)

17. 1537.—Sanskrit and Kanarese; Ś. S. 1459, Hēmaḷambi, (15th Oct.) Kārttika 12. Monday; Lēpākshi (Hindupur, Anantapur): Vīrapratāpa (A)chyutadēva-Mahārāya; his grant of two villages to the temple of Vīrēśvara in the presence of Viṭṭhalēśvara on the Tungabhadra river. (572 of 1912.)

18. 1538.—Tamil; Ś. S. (14)60 expired, Viḷambi; Tiruppattūr (Ramnad); Virapratāpa Achyutadēva-Mahārāya; gift of land for his merit by Periya Rāmappa Nāyakkar to the Bhairava shrine. (121 of 1908.)

19. 1538.—Ś. S. 1460, Nandana (1532); Avanāśi (Coimbatore); Achyuta Rāya; Singaṇa Uḍaiyār's grant to Avanāśilingam treasury of half a *vēli* of land, and the digging of a tank called Śellanga Samudram. (*I. M. P.*, I, p. 523.)

20. 1542.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1464, Plava, Puraṭṭādi 10; Tirukkaḷākkuḍi (Tiruppattūr, Ramnad); gift of land to the temple for the merit of a certain Periya Rāmappa Nāyaka. (65 of 1916.)

21. 1543.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1465, Śōbhakrit, Karkaṭaka, Rōhiṇi, Thursday; Kugaiyūr (Kallakurichchi, South Arcot); remission of certain taxes for worship (*Mahāpūja*) in the temple for the prosperity of Viśvanātha-Nāyaka by his officers. (99 of 1918.)

22. 1545.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1466 expired, Krōdhin; Tiruviḍaimarudūr (Kumbhakonam, Tanjore); Sadāśivadēva-Mahārāya; gift of two villages by Rāmarāja Viṭṭhaladēva-Mahārāja. (140 of 1895.)

23. 1546.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1467 expired, Viśvāvasu, Dhanus, Thursday; Kondagai (Kuntīpura)—(Sivaganga, Ramnad); Sadāśivarāyar; in the presence of Viśvanatha Nāyakkar, the

best skilled in putting down disputes, Timmappa Nāyakkar, the King's agent, settled some disputes between the two sections of the inhabitants of Kondagai. (Burgess, pp. 108-9, No. 21.)

24. 1546.—Grantha and Sanskrit; Ś. S. 1468, Parābhava, K. Y. 4447 (for 4647); Madura; the genealogy of the *Mahāmaṇḍalēsvara* Rāmarāja-Tirumalaraya-Mahārāja. (510 of 1907.)

25. 1546.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1468, Parābhava, Vriśchika, Tiruvōṇam, Friday; Dēvikāpuram (Arni, North Arcot); Sadāśivadēva-Mahārāya; gift of ghee to the temple by Śūrappa-Nāyaka for the merit of Krishṇa(ppa)-Nāyaka. (391 of 1912.)

26. 1547.—Tamil: K.A. 722; Suchīndram (Travancore); Bhūtala-vīra-Rāmavarman; his gift of land for offerings on the birth-day of Viṭṭhalēśvara-mahārāja. (64 of 1896.)

27. 1547.—Grantha and Tamil; Ś. S. 1469, Plavanga; Karivalam-vandanallūr (Śankaranāyinārkōvil, Tinnevelly); Perumāḷ Parākrama Pāṇḍyadēva; an unfinished record in his 4th year. (274 of 1908.)

28. 1547.—Grantha and Tamil; Ś. S. 146(9), Plavanga; Karivalam-vandanallūr; Aḷagan-Perumāḷ Parākramadēva; a record in his fifth year, mentioning his son, Jaṭilavarman *alias* Kō(nērmai)-koṇḍān Tirunelvēli-Perumāḷ. (277 of 1908).

29. 1549.—Kanarese; Ś. S. 1471, Kīlaka, Bhādrapada; Lēpākshi; Vīrapratāpa Sadāśiva; gift for the merit of the *Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara* Rāmarāja-Viṭṭhaladēva. (583 of 1912.)

30. 1550.—Tamil; K. Ā. 725, Saumya; Āḷvārkurichchi (Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly); gift of the village of Peṭṭikuḷam by Rāmappa Nāyakkaraiyan. Mention of a gift by Viśvanātha Nāyaka in K. Ā. 736 (?). (119 of 1907.)

31. 1550.—Grantha and Tamil; Ś. S. 1472, Pingala (1557); Karivalamvandanallūr; Jaṭilavarman, Perumāḷ Kulaśēkharadēva; gift of land; mentions Ativīrarāman and Karivaranallūr in Ari-nāḍu. (276 of 1908.)

32. 1550.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1472, Sādhāraṇa; Guḍimallūr (Walajapet, North Arcot); Sadāśivadēva Mahārāyar; mentions

Kumāra-Krishṇappa Nāyaka and Chinna Bommu Nāyaka. (417 of 1905.)

33. 1550.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1472, Sādhāraṇa, Kanya; Mēlachevval (Vīrakēraḷa-Chaturvēdimangalam in Muḷḷi-nāḍu) (Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly); Vīrapratāpa Sadāśiva-dēva Mahārāya; gift of a *dēvadāna* hold of land (*paṭṭayam*) by Viśvanātha, the agent of the Mahāmaṇḍa-lēśvara Rāmarāja Viṭṭhalayyadēva-Mahārāja, for the merit of the latter. (599 of 1916.)

34. 1550.—Tamil; Ś. S. 147 (2), Sādhāraṇa, Kanya; Mēlachchev-val; Vīrapratāpa Sadāśivadēva-Mahārāya; Uddanḍar, an agent of Viśvanātha Nāyaka; remission of certain taxes due to the King for offering cakes daily to the God by the former for the merit of the latter. (609 of 1916.)

35. 1551.—Tamil; Ś. S. (147)3, Virōdhikrit; Madura; Vīrapra-(tāpa Sadāśiva)deva-Mahārāya; gift of three villages for offerings and festivals to the temple by Timmappa-Nāyakkar, the son of Vaśavaṇa Nāyakkar, for the mert of Rāmarāja-Viṭṭhaladēva-Mahārāja. (559 of 1911.)

36. 1551.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1473, Virōdhikrit; Tenkāśi; Parākrama Pāṇḍya, the son of Jaṭilavarman; gift in his 8th year to a servant of the temple. (132 of 1909.)

37. 1551.—Tamil; (K.Ā.) 726. Āvaṇi 30; Vīravanallūr (Ambā-samudram, Tinnevelly); the *dēvadāna* and *brahmadēya* lands in a number of villages surrounding Śeravanmā-devi, having been abandoned by the dispersing *kuḍi* and the *paḍai*, Viśvanātha Nāyakkar, the agent of Rāma-rājayya Viṭṭhaladēva Mahārāja, remitted all taxes (including *uḷavu* and *panḍāravāḍai*) on these lands, charging only one *kāṇi* per *mā* of land. (721 of 1916.)

38. 1552.—Ś. S. 1474, Virōdhikrit; the Śrīvilliputtūr Plates of Abhirāma Pāṇḍya (Varatunga), the son and grandson of Parākrama Pāṇḍya and Abhirāma Pāṇḍya; gift of the village of Kshīrārjunapura in Muḷḷi-nāḍu to a number of Brāhmaṇas during a solar eclipse. (*T. A. S.*, I, pp. 106–14.)

39. 1552.—Tamil; K.Ā. 727, Paridhāvin, Āḍi 31, Anurādha, Friday; Attalanallūr, (Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly), gift of land by Rāmappa-Nāyaka, the agent of

Viṭṭhaladēva-Mahārāja, under the orders of the king, for conducting the Chitra festival each month in the temple. (428 of 1916.)

40. 1553.—Grantha and Tamil ; Ś.S. 1475, Pramādhin; Śankaranāyinārkōvil ; Pāṇḍya Jaṭilavarman *alias* Kulaśēkharadēva , a record in his third year, mentioning Ari-nāḍu. (281 of 1908.)

41. 1553.—Ś.S. 1475 ; Śankaranāyinārkovil, Kulaśēkhara Pāṇḍya ; grant of the village of Kōṭṭūr to the Goddess in his third year. (*I. M. P.*, III, p. 1475.)

42. 1553.—Tamil ; 1475, K.Ā. 729 ; Iḍakal (Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly); gift of land by Krishṇappa-Nāyaka, the son of Viśvanātha Nāyaka, for worship and repairs in the Tyāgarājasvāmin temple. (467 of 1919.)

43. 1555.—Tamil ; Ś.S. 1477, K. Ā. 7 (. . .) ; Vaḍakku-Kārakkurichchi (Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly) ; gift of land by Ēkāmbara-Mudaliyār, the agent of Krishṇappa-Nāyaka, for a flower-garden to the temple. (530 of 1916.)

44. 1557.—Ś.S. 1479 ; Śankaranāyinārkōvil ; Parākrama Pāṇḍya ; the grant of village in his 16th year. (*I. M. P.*, III, p. 1476.)

45. 1557.—Ś.S. 1479, (Ś. S. 1679 ?) Īśvara (1557) ; Kāramaḍai (Avanāśi, Coimbatore) ; Krishṇa Rāja Uḍaiyār ; Dēva Rājarāsa, his Daḷavāy, granted the village of Bhūsarapaḷḷam to Brahmans. (*Ibid.*, I, p. 523.)

46. 1558.—Tamil ; Ś.S. 1480 expired, K. Ā. 73 (5) ; Kaḷḷaḍakurichchi (Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly); Vīrappa-Nāyakkar Ayyan's gift in favour of blacksmiths and carpenters. (113 of 1907.)

47. 1558.—Grantha and Tamil ; Ś. S. 1480, Kālayukta; Karivalamvandanallūr ; Jaṭilavarman ; mentions Viśvanāthan and Ativīrarāman. (273 of 1908.)

48. 1558.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1480, K.Ā. 734, Kālayukti ; Mārgaḷi 5, Mannārkōvil Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly) ; Viśvanātha-Nāyakar, the agent of Rāmarājadēva-Mahārāja. (381 of 1516.)

49. 1560.—Ś. S. 1482, Raudri ; Tinnevelly ; grant of 12 villages by Viśvanātha, the 'pious son of Kōṭyam Nāgama

Nāyuḍu' and 'Mandaraputtanēri Āryanāyaka Mudaliyār'. (*S.C.P.*, No. 10.)

50. 1560.—Ś. S. 1482, Aṇṇiyūr (Villupuram, South Arcot); Viśvanātha Nāyaka; his grant of lands to the Siva temple during the reign of Sadāśiva Rāya. (Sewell, I. p. 209.)

51. 1560.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1482; Aṇṇiyūr; Vīrapratāpa Sadāśivadēva-Mahārāya; gift of taxes on looms by Viśvanātha Nāyakkar, the son of Nāgama Nāyakkar, for the merit of Aḷiya Rāmarājayyan, the son of *Mahāmanḍalēśvara* Śrīrangarājayyadēva-Mahārāja. (622 of 1915.)

52. 1561.—Ś. S. 1483, Durmati; Śōḷapuram (Śivaganga, Ramnad); Kulaśēkharadēva Ativīrarāma; grant of one *mā* of land and the appointment of a superintendent of the temple by the King in his 13th year. (*I.M.P.*, II, p, 1178.)

53. 1562.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1483 expired, K.Ā. 737, Durmati; Tinnevelly; Rāmappadēva-Mahārāja; gift of land by Krishṇappa-Nāyaka, the son of Viśvanātha-Nāyaka. (121 of 1894)

54. 1562.—Ś. S. 1484, Śankaranāyinārkōvil; Kulaśēkhara; a grant in his 13th year. (*I.M.P.*, III, p. 1475.)

55. 1562.—Tamil: Ś. S. (1484), Durmati, Vaigāśi 5; Iḍakal; Achyutadēva-Mahārāya Sadāśivadēva-Mahārāya; gift of land by Krishṇappa-Nāyaka, the son of Viśvanātha-Nāyaka, to the temple for worship and repairs. (494 of 1916.)

56. 1563.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1485, Krōdhana (1565); Krishṇāpuram, (Tinnevelly); Vīraśrī-Sadāśivadēva-Mahārāya; gift of the villages of Ariyakuḷam. Puttanēri *alias* Tiruvēngaḍanallūr, Poṭṭaikkuḷam, Kōḍikkuḷam, Kuttukkal Śīramānkuḷam and some land in Āḷikuḍi to the temple of Tiruvēngaḍanātha by Krishṇappa-Nāyaka, for the merit of his father, Viśvanātha Nāyaka of the Kāśyapa-gōtra. It is stated that the latter had acquired the Tiruvaḍi-*dēśa*, in which these villages were situated, as *amaranāyakam* from Rāmarājar Ayyan. (17 of 1912; *M.E.R.*, 1912, p. 76.)

57. 1564.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1486, Raktākshin; Tiruttaṇi (Chittoor); an incomplete record of Vīrapratāpa Sadāśivadēva-Mahārāya; he boasts of having looted Ceylon. (451 of 1905.)

58. 1654.—Tamil verse; Ś. S. 1486, Raktākshin; Tenkāśi; Āḷagan Sīvalavēḷ (Ativīrarāma Pāṇḍya); his crowning in this year. (509 of 1909.)

59. 1564.—Tamil; K. Ā. 739, Raktākshi, Mārgaḷi, Uttarāshāḍha, Sunday; Iḍakal; gift of land to the Tyāgarājasvāmin temple by Śinna Vaśavappa-Nāyaka for the merit of Vaśappa Nāyaka, the son of Viśvanātha Nāyaka. (495) of 1916.)

60. 1566.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1488, (K. Ā.) 726 (1550), Sādhāraṇa (1550) Arpaśi 20, Giriyambāpuram (Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly); mentions Dalavāy Rāmappa-Nayaka and his son Peṟṟappa-Nāyaka. (473 of 1916.)

61. 1567.—Sanskrit in Nāgari; Ś. S. 1489, Prabhava; Krishṇāpuram Plates, granted at the request of Krishṇappa Nāyaka, recording the gift of a number of villages to the Tiruvēngaḍanātha temple. (*E. I.*, IX, pp. 328-42.)

62. 1568.—Tamil; Ś. S. 14 (9)0, Vibhava; Tenkāśi; Jaṭilavarman; sale of land by the Bhaṭṭas of Puliyūr in Tennāri-nāḍu to the temple in his 6th year. (533 of 1909.)

63. 1568.—Tamil; Vibha (va); Vaḷuvūr (Wandiwash, North Arcot); Sadāśivadēva-Mahārāya; a damaged record mentioning Krishṇappa Nāyakkarayan. (64 of 1908.)

64. 1569.—K. Ā. 745; Vijayapati (Nānguṇēri, Tinnevelly); Krishṇappa Nāyaka's grant of lands to the Ayyanār shrine. (Sewell, I, p. 316.)

65. 1569.—Kanarese; Ś. S. 1491, Śukla; Koḷḷēgāl (Coimbatore); Vīrapratāpa Sadāśiva-Mahārāya; his gift of a village belonging to Śivanasamudradasthala in Haḍināḍu-śīmē. (15 of 1910).

66. 1570.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1492, K. A. 745, Āni 30; Pāppākuḍi (Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly); Ariyanāyinār-Mudaliyār, Vīrarāghava-Mudaliyār and Śrīkāryam Rāmappa-Nāyaka, the agents of Viśvanātha-Nāyaka, Krishṇappa-Nāyaka, and Vīrappa-Nāyaka, who were themselves the agents of the Mahāmanḍaḷēśvara Ramarāja-Tirumalarāja, appointed a certain Karumugilan Kēraḷādityadēva as the hereditary accountant in the temple at Pāppākuḍi *alias* Ādittavanmachaturvēdimangalam. (478 of 1916.)

67. 1571.—Tamil ; Ś. S. 1493, Kshaya (1566) ; Dēvikāpuram ; Sadāśivadēva-Mahārāya ; a damaged and unfinished record of a gift for the merit of Krishṇappa Nāyaka and others. (403 of 1912).

68. 1572.—Tamil ; K. Y. 4416 (1315), Āngirasa (1572), Mārgaḷi 9 ; Dhārāpuram (Coimbatore) ; Vīrappa-Nāyaka ; Tambigu.........llar Piḷḷai, the agent of the king. (147 of 1920.)

69. 1574.—Tamil ; Ś. S. 1495 expired, Bhava ; Gōripāḷaiyam (Madura), on a pillar set up within the Muhammadan *masjid* ; records the confirmation, by Krishṇappa Nāyaka —Vīrappa Nāyaka, of a considerable area of land presented by Kūn (Sundara) Pāṇḍya to the Muhammadans (Sewell, i. p. 292 ; Nelson, p. 67 ; 77 of 1905.)

70. 1577.—Tamil ; Ś. S. 1499, Īśvara ; Krishṇāpuram ; Śrīrangadēva-Mahārāya ; gift by Virappa-Nāyaka for the merit of his father Krishṇappa-Nāyaka of the Kāśyapa-gōtra, to the temple of Tiruvēngaḍanāthadēva at Krishṇāpuram on the bank of the Tāmraparṇi ; mentions the Tiruvaḍi-*dēśam*. (16 of 1912 ; Sewell, i. p. 310.) Sewell's date for this inscription is 1578.

71. 1578.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1500, Vikrama (1580) ; Rāmēśvaram ; a mutilated record mentioning Viśvanātha Nāyakkar Ayyan. (98 of 1903.)

72. 1578.—Tamil ; Ś. S. 1500, K.Ā. 75(3). Bhahudānya, Vaigāśi 19 ; Śērmādēvi ; Śrīrangadēva-Mahārāya ; gift of land by Vīrappa-Nāyaka-Viśvanātha-Nāyaka, the son of Viśvanātha-Nāyaka-Krishṇappa-Nāyaka, who was an agent of the king, to a temple for conducting certain festivals. (663 of 1916.).

73. 1581.—Tamil ; Ś S. 1503, Vikrama, Āḍi 2 ; Madura ; Vīrappa-Nāyaka, the son of Viśanātha-Nāyaka ; taxes received in the treasuries of the Nāyaka and Śokkanātha on account of the Rāmēśvaram temple ; gift of 700 *pon* to this temple. (340 of 1918.)

74. 1582.—Tamil ; Chitrabhānu ; Rāmēśvaram ; gift of land for the merit of Viśvanātha-Nāyaka - Virappa - Nāyakkar Ayyan. (97 of 1903.)

75. 1582.—Telugu; Ś. S. 1505, Svabhānu, Māgha; Śrimūshṇam (Chidambaram, South Arcot); Vīrapratāpa Vīraśrī-rangarāyadēva-Mahārāya, ruling from Penukoṇḍa; Koṇḍamanāyanigāru, the son of Krishṇappanāyanigāru of the Kāśyapa-gōtra, remitted the *jōḍi* and *virāḍa* on thirty-eight villages of the temple in Bhōnagiri-paṭṇam-śīma. (266 of 1916).

76. 1583.—Sanskrit in Grantha; Ś. S. 1505, Subhānu; the Pudukkōṭṭai (Śrīvilliputtūr, Rāmnad) Plates of Śrī Vallabha and Varatunga Rāma Pāṇḍya. This copper plate grant gives a short account of the later Pāṇḍyas, and records the gift of the village of Pudukkōṭṭai by a certain Tirumala Nāyaka with the approval of Vīrappa (Nāyaka of Madura). Ś. S. 1505 is said to be the twenty-first year of the coronation of Śrī Vallabha and Ativīrarāma Pāṇḍya. (7 of Appendix A, 1906; *M.E.R.*, 1906, pp. 71-2; *T. A. S.*, i, pp. 61-88).

77. 1584.—Telugu; Ś. S. 1505 expired, Subhānu; Madura; construction of the *Kambattaḍi maṇḍapa*, in the Sundarēśvara temple, with a number of sculptured pillars representing Purāṇic scenes, in the reign of Vīrappa-Nāyaka, the son of Viśvanātha-Nāyaka-Krishṇappa-Nāyaka. (35 of 1908; Sewell, i, p. 293.)

78. 1584.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1505 expired, Chitrabhānu; Tiruttarakōśamangai (Ramnad); Śevvappa-Nāyaka-Achyutappa-Nāyaka; his gift at Rāma-sētu of a village in the Chola country to the local temple in Śrīdēśam, a sub-division of Śembināḍu. (84 of 1905.)

79. 1586.—Tamil; Vyaya; Perambalūr (Trichinopoly); remission of *jōḍi* on the village of Nochchiyam by an agent of Krishṇappa-Nāyaka. A small amount of this tax was collected from this village in the time of Śūrappa-Nāyaka. (10 of 1913.)

80. 1586.—Sanskrit in Nāgari; Ś. S. 1508, Vyaya; Madura; the Daḷavāy Agrahāram Plates of Venkaṭapati I; gift of the village of Gangavārappaṭṭi or Vīrabhūpasamudram to a number of Brahmans at the request of Vīrappa Nāyaka, the son of Krishṇappa-Nāyaka and grandson of Viśvanātha. (*E.I.* xii, pp. 159-87.)

81. 1588.—Ś.S. 1510; Pirānmalai (Tiruppattūr, Ramnad); Venkaṭapati Rāya (I); his record. (Sewell, i, p. 297.)

82. 1588.—Ś.S. 1510, K.Ā. 765; Mannārkōvii (Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly); a gift of Udaya Mārttānda. (*I.M.P.*, iii, p. 1455.)

83. 1588.—Ś.S. 1510, Sarvajit; Śankaranāyinārkōvil; Vallabhadēva; a grant in his twenty-sixth year. (*Ibid.*, p. 1475.)

84. 1588.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1501 (a mistake for 1510) expired, Sarvadhārin; Erode; Vīra Venkaṭapathi Rāya (I); a grant by Vīrappa Nāyaka. (13 of 1891; *M.E.R.*, 1892, p.9.)

85. 1590.—Ś.S. 1512, Vikriti; Tinnevelly; Venkaṭapati; grant from Kumbhakonam of villages in the Tinnevelly district, to a Vaishṇava shrine under the management of one Krishṇa Dās. (*S.C.P.*, No. 12.)

86. 1590.—Tamil; Ś.S. 151 (1) expired, Virōdhin (1589); Perumukkal (Tinḍivanam, South Arcot); Venkaṭapatidēva-Mahārāya; mentions Bommu Nāyaka, the son of Nāgama-Nāyaka; Konḍama Nāyaka, the son of Krishṇappa-Nāyaka. (36 of 1905.)

87. 1594.—Grantha and Tamil; Ś.S. 151 (.) expired, K.Ā. 769; Śērmādēvi (Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly); Srīrangadēva-Mahārāya; mentions Viśvanātha-Krishṇappa-Vīrappa Nāyaka as a feudatory. (187 of 1895.)

88. 1594.—Tamil; (Ja)ya; Periyakōṭṭai (Paḷni, Madura); building of the temple of Kadirināga-(nātha) Perumāḷ, and of a tank by an agent of Vīrappa Nāyakkar Aiyan, 'who levied tribute from every country'. (470 of 1907.)

89. 1595.—Tamil (Ś. S.) 15(17), Manmatha; Karivalamvandanallūr (Śankaranāyinārkōvil, Tinnevelly); Jaṭilavarman, Vīra Panḍyadēva; a much damaged record in his tenth year. (275 of 1908.)

90. 1595.—Tamil; Ś.S. 15 (17), Manmatha, Vaigāśi 11; Pāraippaṭṭi (Ōṭapiḍāram, Tinnevely); *Irandakālameḍutta* Ativīrarāman; a *sarvamānya* grant of land to three private individuals during the reign of Venkaṭapatirāya whose ancestors, Dēvarāya, Krishṇarāya, Sadāśivarāya, Vīra Narasimharāya, Dharmarāya and Śrīrangarāya, are mentioned with a string of Vijayangar and Sāḷuva *birudas*. (615 of of 1915.)

91. 1596.—Grantha; (Ś.S.) 1518, Manmatha; Perungaruṇai (Mudukuḷattūr; Ramnad), a fragment of a record mentioning Krishṇabhūpa, the son of Vīrabhūpa. (404 1907.)

92. 1596.—Sanskrit in Grantha; (Ś.S.) 1518; Madura; Rāma Krishṇappa, 'sitting on the lion-throne of Vallabha Narēndra after thirty-three years have passed, and after Ś.S. 1517,' granted the viliage of Naḍikkuḍi or Ativīrarāmapuram to a number of Brahmans. The figure of a boar with a dagger standing on its nose is engraved at the end, This is the same as the third Daḷavāy Agrahāram Plates. (*S.C.P.*, No. 211; *T.A.S.*, i, pp. 133-46.)

93. 1596.—Tamil verse; Ś.S. 1518, Durmukhi; Tenkāśi; Ativīrarāma Pānḍya; taxes collected by mistake at Viśvanāthanallūr in his thirty-ninth year were returned to the temple, and the village was confirmed as a *sarvamānya* to it. (515 of 1909.)

94. 1597.—Sanskrit in Nāgari; Ś.S. 1519, Hēviḷambi; Madura grant issued by Venkaṭapati (I) at the request of Krishṇappa Nāyaka, who is styled 'Pānḍya Pārthiva Krishṇa Nṛpatiḥ', of the two villages of Marudanguḍi and Kārupuram, otherwise called Madanagōpālapuram to several Vaishṇava Brahmans. The following genealogy of the Nāyaks is given: Nāganṛpati-Viśvanātha-Krishṇa-Vīrabhūpati-Krishṇa. (*S.C.P.*, No. 136.)

95. 1597.—Tamil; Hēviḷabmbi, Arpaśi; Panaiyāvaram (Villupuram South Arcot); Venkaṭapatidēva-Mahārāja; mentions Muttukrishṇappa-Nāyaka. (329 of 1917.)

96. 1598.—Sanskrit in Nāgari; Ś.S. 1520, Viḷambi; Kallaḍakurichchi (Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly); 'Vīra Venkaṭapatidēvarāya; the Veḷḷanguḍi Plates; gift of the village of Veḷḷangoḷḷi, surnamed Vīrabhūpasamudram in Muḷḷināḍn in Tiruvaḍi-*dēśa*, to a number of Brāhmaṇas. It was in 261 shares, and at the instance of Vīra Krishṇa Nāyaka. It is said that Viśvanātha, the first ruler, conquered many kings, including the Pānḍyas, on the battlefield in the Tiruvaḍi country, and acquired by force the sovereignty over Madhura-*rājya*. The genealogy of the Nāyaks is given: Nāga-Viśvanātha-Krishṇa married Tirumalāmbikā-Vīra Krishṇa. (9 of Appendix A, 1912; *M.E.R.*, 1912, p. 76.)

97. 1598.—Sanskrit in Nāgari; Ś.S. 1520, Viḷambin; Padmanēri (Nānguneri, Tinnevely); grant of this village in the Tiruvaḍi-*rājya* by Venkaṭapatidēvarāya to Brāhmaṇas at the request of Krishṇappa Nāyaka, who acknowledges him as the paramount sovereign and original donor, he himself being only secondary donor. It contains the information that Viśvanātha, the founder of the Nāyak dynasty, conquered in battle the Tiruvaḍi, the Pānḍya King, Vāṇādarāya and other kings, and annexed their dominions. (14 of Appendix A, 1906; *S.C.P.*, No. 111; *M.E.R.*, 1906, p. 86; and 1909, p. 119.)

98. 1600.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1522, K.Ā. 77 (4), Vikārin, Vaigāśi (2) 6; Śērmādēvi; the appointment of an accountant at the instance of Mūrti-Śeṭṭiyār, an agent of Viśvantha-Nāyaka Krishṇappa-Nāyaka. (717 of 1916.)

99. 1602.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1523 expired, Subhakrit; Madura; Vīra—Venkaṭa-Mahārāya; mentions the temple of Madana-gōpāla at Madura and Bhāshyakāra, i.e. Śrī-Rāmānujā-chārya. (36 of 1908.)

100. 1604.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1525 expired Śōbhakrit; Tinḍivanam; Venkaṭapatirāya; tax on weavers given to the temple by Bommu-Nāyaka, the agent of Nāgama-Nāyaka. (31 of 1905.)

101. 1604.—Kanarese; Ś.S. 1526, Krōdhin; Śivasamudram (Koḷḷē-gāl, Coimbatore); Venkaṭapatirāya; gift of land by Tirumalarāja-Nāyaka. (356 of 1901.)

102. 1606.—K.Ā. 782; Cape Comorin; Muttu Vīrappa; his gift of lands at Kākkarai and other places in Tinnevelly to the Bhagavatī temple. (V. Nagam Aiya, *The Travancore State Manual*, i, p. 302.)

103. 1606.—Tamil; Parābhava; Tāyanūr (Tirukkōyilūr, South Arcot); mentions Vānādarāyar, the agent of Vīrappa-Nāyakkarayyan. (366 of 1909.)

104. 1606.—Tamil, (Pira) ba (Parābhava), Panguni 3; Panaiyāva-ram (Villupuram, South Arcot); gift of a garden for the merit of Muttu Krishṇāppa Nāyaka. (326 of 1917.)

105. 1607.—Tamil Ś; S. 1527, Parābhava; Rāmēśvaram; Daḷavāy Sētupati Kāttatēvar; gift of five villages to the temple of Rāmanāthasvāmi and Parvatavardhani-Amman for

worship and offerings. (11 of Appendix A, 1911; *M.E.R.*, 1911, pp. 88-9.)

106. 1608.—Tamil and Grantha; Ś. S. 1529 expired, Plavanga, fourth lunar day of the bright fortnight in Āḍi; Rāmēśvaram; Tirumalai Uḍaiyān-Sētupati, the lord of the city of Tēvai; the responsible agent lord for the protection of the Sētu embankment; the responsible agent for the charities of Rāmanāthasvāmi; who is actively engaged in worshipping Śiva; the chief of all other kings; the destroyer of the army of Ariyarāya; who cuts into a thousand piece and three thousand pieces those failing in the correctness of their language; who conquers all the country that he sees and never gives back a country once conquered; the punisher of Mūvarāya; the lord of the valorous and the fertile country; the protector of the Brahmans studying the Vēdas; who has put down the pride and prosperity of the valorous and inimical Yavana kings; living in Kārattūr of the Tukāvūr division; his gift of lands on the occasion of his pilgrimage, to the people of the 'five countries' who served as priests, worshippers and cooks in the temple. (Burgess, Sētupati Grant, No. 2).

107. 1608.—Ś.S. 1530; Rāmēśvaram; in the days of Viśubhūpati, the temple was repaired by Sage Rāmanātha. (Burgess p. 59, No. 10.)

108. 1608.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1530; Rāmēśvaram ; the building of the Rāmalingēśvara temple during the time of Vīrabhūpati. (102 of 1903.)

109. 1608.—Tamil ; S. Ś. 1530; Plavanga, Rāmēśvaram; Daḷavāy Sétupati Kāttatēvar; gift of eight villages to the temple. (12 of Appendix A, 1911.)

110. 1609.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1530 expired; Kīlaka; Tiruttarākōśamangai; gift of money to celebrate certain festivals for the merit of Muttuvīrappa Nāyaka. (87 of 1905).

111. 1609.—Sanskrit in Nāgari; Ś S. 15 (3) 1, Saumya; Madura; Venkaṭapatidēvarāya; his gift of the village of Nāgenallūru, surnamed Mudduvīramahīpālasamudra, to Brāhmaṇas at the request of Mudduvirappa Nāyaka. (9 of Appendix A, 1909.)

112. 1610.—Tamil; Ś. S. 15 (3) 2 expired, K. Ā. 787; Āḷvārkurichchi (Ambāsamūdram, Tinnevelly); gift of land to the

temple on the bank of Vaṇṇitīrtha for the merit of Viśvanātha-Nāyakkar - Vīrappa - Nāyakkar Muttu-vīrappa Nāyakkar Ayyan. (122 of 1907.)

113. 1610.—Grantha; Ś, S. 1532, Īśvara (1637); Pāḷaiyamkōṭṭai (Tinnevelly): Tirumala Nāyaka and Viśvanātha Nāyaka; grant of four *mās* of land in Rājavallipuram *to* Teppakuḷam Rāmabhadrasvāmi *in the reign of* Sadāśivarāya, (*I.M.P.*, iii, p. 1493.)

114. 1610.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1532, Saumya, Āni, Pūśa asterism; Madura; Viśvanātha Nāyakkar—Vīrappa Nāyakkar exempted the Mudaliyār servants of the Śokkanātha-svāmi temple, living in Annaikuḍi and other villages, from the levying of brokerage. (Burgess, pp. 109-10, No. 23.)

115. 1612.—Tamil, Ś. S. 15 (34) expired; K. Ā. 788, Paridhāvin, Āḻvārkurichchi; gift for the merit of Viśvanāthā-Nāyak-kar-Muttu Virappa Nāyakkar (123 of 1907),

116. 1613—.Ś,S. 1535; Madurat Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka, (Sewell, i, p. 293)

117. 1613.—Telugu; Ś.S. 1535, K. Ā. 789, Pramādhīcha, Tai 13, Wednesday, Veḷḷanguḍi; Vīra-Venkaṭapatirāya 'ruling at Vijayanagara'; registers that a certain Venkaṭadri Bhaṭṭar, the son of Timmarāsa, set up at Veḷḷanguḍi *alias* Vīrabhūpālasamudra the images of Krishṇa and Kāmēśvari, and granted land for their worship. The country was directly under the rule of Viśvanātha-Vīrappa, and the land granted had been obtained as a grant from Viśvanātha-Krishṇappa Nāyaka. (452 of 1916.)

118. 1617.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1539, K.Ā- 792, Naḷa; Aḍaichchāṇi (Ambā-samudram, Tinnevelly); gift of certain privileges, in respect of tanks and ponds, to the residents by Śinna Tipparāhuttaraiyan for the merit of Muttu-Vīrappa—Nāyakar. (556 of 1911.)

119. 1617.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1539 expired, Pingala; Trichinopoly; Venkaṭadēva Mahārāya; damaged record of a gift for the merit of Vīrappa-Nāyaka. (134 of 1905.)

120. 1620.—Tamil and Grantha; S.S. 1542, Kālayukti (1618); Coimbatore; grant by Raghunāthadēva Mahārāja, the

son of Śrī Venkaṭadēva Mahārāja of Uraiyūr, the agent of Viśvanātha Nayaka-Vīrappa Nāyaka and feudatory of Vīra Rāmanēva, the ruling at Penukoṇḍa (*S.C.P.*, No. 187.)

121. 1623.—Ś.S. 1545, Śrīmukha (1633); Kīḷakkuḷattūr (Uḍaiyārpāḷaiyam, Trichinopoly), Rāmayya, the minister of Viśvanātha Nāyaka, granted 1,000 *kuḷis* of land in the village to the God. (*I.M.P*, iii, p. 1614.)

122. 1623.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1545, Rudhirōdgāri, Māśi 21 (about the 3rd of March, 1624); Wednesday; Rāmēśvaram; the *naḍamāḷika manḍapam* and the *Ārūḍha manḍapam* in the first *prākāra* of the Rāmanāthasvāmi temple were built by Kūttan Sētupati Kātta Tēvar, the son of Uḍaiyanāyan Sētupati Kātta Tēvar. (Burgess, p. 60, No. 15.)

123. 1623.—Ś.S. 1545; Madura; Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka. (Sewell, i; p. 292.)

124. 1623.—Tamil; Ś.Ś. 1545, K.Ā. 799, Rudhirōdgāri, Kārtika (1) 6, Sunday; Ambāsamudram; orders of the priest that the five subdivisions of Kaṇṇāḷar (Kammāḷar) be prohibited from communal fellowship, in accordance with the general orders of Viśvanatha Nāyaka-Vīrappa Nāyaka-Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka. (309 of 1916.)

125. 1625.—Tamil; S, S. 1547, K.Ā. 798 (1922), Rudhirōdgāri, Vaikāśi 15 (about the 27th of May, 1623); Brahmadēśam; registers the royal writ granted by Viśvanātha Nāyaka-Vīrappa Nāyaka that the members of the five sub-divisions of artisans (Kaṇmāḷar) should not intermingle with each other (*Uḍankūṭṭam vēṇḍam*), (378 of 1916.)

126. 1630.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1 (5) 5 (3), K.Ā. 805, Pramōda; Terkukāriśēri (Śrīvaikunṭham, Tinnevelly); mentions Kāriśēri in Amudaguṇṇavaḷa-nāḍu, and records a gift for the merit of Periyanāyakkarayyan. (23 of 1912.)

127. 1630.—Tamil; Ś.S. 155 (2), Śukla, Tai 21, Monday; Dēvikāpuram (Arni, North Arcot); Venkaṭadēva-Mahārāya, the son of Tirumalaidēva-Mahārāya; Nāyinappa-Nāyaka, the son of Krishṇappa-Nāyaka, improved a certain land by constructing a tank near it and by digging wells. He made it cultivable and presented it to the temple. (388 of 1912).

128. 1634.—Sanskrit in Nāgari; Ś.S. 1556, Bhava, Vaikāśi; Kūniyūr (Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly); the Kūniyūr Plātes of Venkaṭa II; Vīra Venkaṭāpati Mahārāya granted to a mumber of Brahmans the village of Kūniyūr to Muttukrishṇapuram in the Vīravanallūr *māghāna* (mākāṇi) in Muḷḷi-nāḍu in Tiruvaḍi-*rājya*. The pedigree of the last Vijayanagar dynasty and of the Nāyaks of Madura is given. The grant was issued at the request of Tirumala Nāyaka. (*E.I.*, iii. pp. 236-58; *M.F.R.*, 1891, p. 6.)

129. 1635.—K.Ā. 810, Kumbham (Māśi) 22; an edict of the king of Travancore to the ryots of Nānjināḍ, regarding remission of some taxes on land, owing to the advent to Tirumala Nayakar's forces. (V. Nagam Aiya, *The Travancore State Manual*, pp. 302-3.)

130. 1635.—K.Ā. 811; Āḷaḍiyūr (Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly), Tirumala Nāyaka; his gift of lands to the local Śiva temple. His name appears on the side of the sluice of the tank. (Sewell, i, p. 309.)

131. 1637.—K.Y. 4738, Īśvara; Kapilamalai (Nāmakkal, Salem); Tirumala Nāyaka; his gift of lands to the temple (*Ibid.*, p. 203.)

132. 1638.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1560, K.Ā. 813, Bahudānya, Vaikāśi 15 (27th May); Mēlāmbūr (Pūngurichchi); taxes levied on tenants residing at the eastern corner of Pudukkuḷam and granted to the temple for the merit of Nāgaiyya-Viśvanātha Nāyaka-Tirumalai Nāyaka, and of Vaidyappayyar, Rāmappayyar and Krishṇappayyar. (519 of 1916.)

133. 1640.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1562, Vishu (1641); Vēmbanguḍi (Śivaganga, Ramnad); a gift for the merit of Tirumalai-Nāyakkarayyan. (120 of 1910.)

134. 1642.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1564. Chitrabhānu; Tiruppaḷāturai (Trichinopoly); Viśvanātha Nāyakkar-Tirumalai Nāyakkarayyan; his gift of land; reference is made to 289 of 1903. (290 of 1903.)

135. 1642.—225 (?), Chitrabhānu; Tirumuruganpūṇḍi (Palladam, Coimbatore); Tirumala Nāyaka; his *guru* Raghunātha Puṇḍit and the people of the neighbouring villages granted to Subrahmaṇya Puṇḍit, the priest of

the temple, a piece of land and the contribution of one *paṇam* per house every year, and two *paṇams* for a marriage. (*I.M.P.*, i, p. 560.)

136. 1643.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1565, Pramādi (1639), Āni 16; Pudūr (Tirumangalam, Madura); gift of the village of Tirumalasamudram to the temple of Śokkanāthasvāmin for conducting certain festivals in the month of Tai, Vaiyāśi and Āni for the merit of Tirumalai Nāyakkar, the son of Viśvanātha Nāyakkar. (395 of 1914.)

137. 1644.—Tamil; K. Ā. 81 (9), Svabhānu, Āḍi 1 (5); Āḷaḍiyūr; gift of this village through the agency of Pūvanātha Panḍāram for repairs in the big *gōpura*, and (the temple) of Śokkanāthasvāmi by Viśvanātha Nāyakkar-Tirumalai Nāyakkar. (293 of 1916.)

138. 1647.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1569, K.Ā. 824, Sarvadhārin, Āvaṇi 3, Thursday; Vairāvikuḷam (Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly); gift of this village, west of Kaḷḷaḍaikurichchi in Muḷḷi-vaḷanāḍu, to the Tirugñāna-sambandha-Paṇḍāram at Madura for the merit of Viśvanātha Nayakkar-Tirumalai Nāyakkar and of Emberumān Piḷḷai. (285 of 1916.)

139. 1648.—Ś.S. 1570, K.Ā. 824; Vairāvikuḷam; Tirumala Nāyaka; This gift of lands to a Śūdra priest. (Sewell, i, p. 310.)

140. 1648.—Tamil; K.Ā. 823, Kārttigai 22; Śivaśailam; food to *paradēśis* was regularly distributed in the time of Rāmappayyan; in the time of Sokkalinganāyakkarayyan, it continued with a break of five or six days. This defect was rectified and the twelve *paḍis* of cooked rice were received. (521 of 1916.)

141. 1650.—Tamil; Vikrita; Paḷḷimaḍam (Aruppukkōṭṭai, Ramnad); Tirumala Nāyaka, the king and Mutturāmalinga Pānḍuḍaiyāntorai met at Paḷḷimaḍam, when they gave a copper plate charter to an *ambalakāran*. Another in the same year. (5 and 6 of Appendix A, 1911; *M.E.R.*, 1911, p. 89.)

142. 1651.—Khara; Madura; Tirumala Nāyaka; his grant to a private individual. *S.C.P.*, No. 199.)

143. 1652.—Ś.S. 1574; Yerumaippaṭṭi (Nāmakkal); Tirumala Nāyaka; gift of some lands by a private party during his reign. (Sewell, i, p. 204.)

144. 1653.—Ānanda; Madura; Tirumala Nāyaka; his tour round the kingdom; grant of lands to a Kauṇḍan of Nallamāram for hospitable reception and loyalty. (*S.C.P.*, No. 92.)

Note.—The date given by Sewell for this inscription is 1656. But Ānanda must be 1614 or 1674. If the cyclic year is a mistake for Nandana, the date would be 1652-3.

145. 1654.—Jaya; Madura; Tirumala Nāyaka; his grant to Śrī Ranga Nāyakka, the lord of Veḷḷikurichchi (*Veḷḷikurichchi Śimaikku kartar*) as reward for his services in slaying tigers. (*S.C.P.*, No. 197,)

146. 1655.—Kanarese; Ma (nma) tha; Erode; Kanṭhīrava Narasarāja-Vaḍēru; mentions Daḷavāyi Hampai(ya) and Madhura. (170 of 1910); *Mysore Gazetteer*, i, p. 364.)

147. 1655.—Telugu; Ś.S. 1577, Monmatha; Kaṇṇaḍipūttūr (Uḍumalpet, Coimbatore); Tirumala Nāyaka; his grant of lands to a Brahman in the reign of Śrī-Ranga Rāya. (*S.C.P.*, No. 190.)

148. 1656.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1579, Viḷambi; Rāmēśvaram; Tirumalai Raghunātha Sētupati Kāttatēvar who performed the *Hiraṇyagarbha* ceremony; gift of land and a copper charter to Ahōbalayya of the Kauṇḍinya-gōtra. (10 of Appendix A, 1911.)

149. 1657.—Telugu; Ś.S. 1579, Hēviḷambi; Tinnevelly; grant of land in the villages of Tirumalasamudram and Pudukkuḷam to a Brahman by name Śrī Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa Nāyakka, the son of Chokkanātha and grandson of Tirumala Nāyakka. (*S.C.P.*, No. 52,)

150. 1658.—Ś. S. 1580, Viśvāvasu (1545); Śrīrangam; Madura Rāman gave half a *vēli* of land to the God in the reign of Viśvanātha Nāyakar. (*I.M.P.*, iii, p. 1571.)

151. 1659.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1581, Viḷamba; Tiruchchengōḍu; gift of the village of Kōḷanganḍai in Parittippaḷḷi-nāḍu by Viśvanātha-Tirumala-Nāyaka for the merit of Kumāra Muttu Tirumala Nāyaka. (650 of 1905,)

152. 1659.—Ś.S. 1581; Tiruchchengōḍu; gift of a village to the temple by Kumāra Muttu Tirumala Nāyakka, during his father's reign. (Sewell, i, p. 203.)

153. 1659.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1581, Hēviḷambi; Rāmēśvaram; grant of land to Śankara Gurukkaḷ and others of the Marāṭha Gurukkaḷ Assembly, to provide for the comforts of Marāṭha and other pilgrims, by Raghunātha Sētupati, the son of *Hiraṇyagarbhayājī* Raghunātha Sētupati, who has a long list of titles very similar to those given in No, 106. (Burgess, Sētupati Grant; No. 5.)

154. 1659.—Tamil; Ś,S. 1580 expired, Hēviḷambi (1657); Rāmēś-varam; grant to Śankara Gurukkaḷ and others for conducting the *Navarātri* festival, by Raghunātha Tirumalai Sētupati Kātta Tēvar, the son of Thiru-mali Sētupathi Kātta Tēvar, with the same titles as above. (*Ibid.*, No. 6.)

155. 1659.—Kanarese; Ś.S. 1581, Vikāri; Singanallūr Koḷḷēgāl, Coimbatore); Śrīra (nga) rāya; mentions a certain Dēvarāja-Voḍēya. (20 of 1910.)

156. 1661.—Ś.S. 1583; Nanmēni (Śāttūr, Ramnad); grant of a tank to the temple in honour of Chokkalinga Nāyaka and others. (Sewell, i, p. 305.)

157. 1662.—Telugu; Ś,S. 1584, K.Y. 4763, Śōbhakrit; Śrīrangam; grant of land to the temple priest by Chokkanātha, the son of Muttu Vīrappa and grandson of Tirumala Nāyaka, when Śrīranga was reigning at Ghānagiri. (*S.C.P.*, No. 51.)

158. 1663.—Tamil (prose and verse); Ś.S. 1585, Śōbhana; Tiruch-chengōḍu; the building of the *gopura* and of the temple of Kāśi-Viśvēśvara on the hill by Viśvanātha-Chokka-linga Nāyaka. (654 of 1905; Sewell, i, p. 203.)

159. 1663.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1585, Subhānu; Rāmēśvaram; grants to the hereditary priesthood by Muttu Rāmalinga Vijaya Raghunātha Sētupati. (Burgess, Setupati Grant, No. 16.)

160. 1663.—Telugu; S. S. 1585, Śōbhakrit; Bellary; gift of the village of Bairēhaḷḷi to a Brahman of Śrīśailam by Śrīranga (III), then at Vēlāpurī on his 'jewelled lion throne'. (*S.C.P.*, No. 128.)

161. 1663.—Dēva Rāja: the grandson of Chāma Rāja; one of his titles being, 'skilful in cutting down the strong-armed Pāṇḍya'. (*E.C.*, Mysore, 1, T.N., No. 23.)

162. 1663.—Doḍḍadēva Rāja Oḍēyar; his Nanjangūḍ Plates; one of his titles being, the 'destroyer of the Pāṇḍya King'. (*Mysore Archaeological Report*, 1917, p. 59.)

163. 1664.—Ś. S. 1586, Parābhava (1666); Śrīrangam; gift of a village to Gods Ranganatha and Tiruvēngaḍanātha by Viśvanātha Nāyaka Chokkanātha Nāyaka. (*I.M.P.*, iii, p. 1572.)

164. 1665.—Ś. S. 1587; Nenmēni; a grant in honour of Chokkalinga and others. (Sewell, i, p. 305.)

165. 1665.—Ś. S. 1587, Viśvāvasu: Kaṇṇaḍiputtūr; Viśvanātha Nāyaka-Chokkanātha Nāyaka; one Vīra Nāyaka granted fifteen *mās* of land in the Kaṇiyūr village to the local temple in the reign of Śrirangadēva. (*I.M.P.*, i, p. 562.)

166. 1665.—Tamil and Grantha; Ś.S. 1587, Viśvāvasu; Kaṇiyūr (Uḍumalpet, Coimbatore); Viśvanātha-Tirumala-Vīrappa-Chokkanātha Nāyaka; his grant of lands to the Brahmans of the neighbouring village of Koḷumam in the reign of Śrīrangadēva Mahārāya. (*S.C.P.*, No. 186.)

167. 1666.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1588, Kīlaka (1668); Tiruchchengōḍu; grant of land by Chokkanātha-Nāyaka, the son of Vi(śva)nātha Nāyaka Tirumala Nāyaka-Muttuvīrappa Nāyaka. (649 of 1905.)

168. 1667.—Telugu and Grantha; Ś. S. 1589, Plavanga; Kumāralingam (Uḍumalpet, Coimbatore); Viśvanātha-Tirumala - Vīrappa - Chokkanātha Nāyaka; his grant of lands in the village to a Brahman in the rēign of Śrirangadēva Rāya. (*S.C.P.*, No. 188.)

169. 1668.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1589 expired, Plavanga, Vaikāśi, Thursday; Rāmēśvaram; grant of the two villages of Ānandūr and Pāppākuḍi to the temple by a Perumāḷ Śērvaikāran of Pānḍiyūr for the merit of Tirumalai *Hiraṇyagarbhayājī* Raghunātha Tēvar, the son of Daḷavāy Sētupati Kātta Tēvar. (Burgess, Sētupati Grant, No. 7.)

170. 1669.—Ś. S. 1591, Saumya; Śrīrangam; gift of two *vēlis* and four *mās* of land in Umayāpuram and elsewhere to God Ranganātha by Aḷagiri Nāyakan, the son of Chinnama Nāyakan. (*I.M.P.*, iii, p. 1572.)

171. 1669.—Ś. S. 1591, Saumya; Satyamangalam (Gōpicheṭṭipāḷaiyam, Coimbatore); grant of land by Dēvarāja Uḍaiyār in the village of 'Comaree'. (*Ibid.*, i, p. 551.)

172. 1669.—Kanarese; Ś. S. 1591. Saumya (1669-70); Sengalarai (near Satyamangalam); Vīrapratāpa Dēvarāja-Voḍēya; mentions Satyāmangala in Uḍuvanka-nāḍu, and registers a gift to the temple of Kumārasvāmin on the Dhavaḷagiri hill in Durvāsa-kshētra at the confluence of the rivers Chintāmaṇi and Bhavāni. (181 of 1910.)

173. 1670.—Tamil; Ś. S. 1591 expired, Saumya; Tirumeyyam (Pudukotta State); gift for the merit of Tirumalai Sētupati Kātta Daḷavāy Raghunāthanarēndra. (394 and 398 of 1906.)

174. 1671.—Kanarese; Ś. S. 1593, Virōdhikrit; Viṇṇappaḷḷi (Gōpicheṭṭipāḷaiyam, Coimbatore); Dēvarāja Udaiyār divided the village into sixty-four shares and granted it to sixty-four Brahmans. (*I.M.P.*, i, p. 552.)

175. 1673.—Tamil; S.S. 1595; Hanumantaguḍi (Tiruvāḍānai, Ramnad); Tirumalai Sētupati Kātta Tēvar; gift of lands to a Musalman. (Sewell, i, p. 298.)

176. 1673.—Ś.S. 1595; Doḍḍa Bēlūr (Hōsūr, Salem); Chikka-dēva Rāja; on a local anicut; construction of the same by Kumārarāya Daḷavāy in his reign. (Sewell, i, p. 194.)

177. 1674.—Ś.S. 1596, Ānanda; Śrīrangam; Chinna Bomma-Nāyaka granted a village for Gods Gōpālakrishṇa and Ranganātha in the reign of Viśvanātha Nāyakan-Chokkanātha Nāyakan. (*I.M.P.*, iii, p. 1572.)

178. 1674.—Ś.S. 1596; Ānanda; Śrīrangam; Chinna Bomma-nāyaka granted the village of 'Vohacoode' to Gods Gōpālakrishṇa and Ranganātha in the reign of Viśva-nātha Nāyakar Chokkanātha Nāyakar. (*Ibid.*)

179. 1674.—Ś.S. 1596, Ānanda; Śrīrangam; Rāyasam Basava-Rāja gave the village of 'Mungalooroo' to Gods Ranganātha and Varadarāja and Rāmānuja *kūṭam* in the reign of Viśvanātha Nāyakar-Chokkanātha Nāyakkar. (*Ibid.*)

180. 1674.—Chikkadēvarāja; one of his titles—'Karṇāṭaka Chakravarti'. (*Mysore Archaeological Report*, 1912, p. 57.)

181. 1676—Ś.S.1598, Naḷa; Kumārapāḷaiyam; one Ranganātha Śeṭṭi and another erected two *maṇḍapams*, and granted one *salagai* of paddy land in the reign of Chikka-Dēva. (*I.M.P.*, i, p. 527.)

182. 1676.—Tamil; S.S. 1598, Naḷa; Satyamangalam; Vīrapratāpa Chikadēvarāja, ruling at Maisūr; the building of a temple for Kumārasvāmi on the Dhavaḷagiri hill at the confluence of the rivers Chintāmaṇi and Bhavāni at Satyamangalam in Oḍuvanga-nāḍu. (209 of 1909; *M.E.R.*, 1910, p. 116.)

183. 1678.—Telugu; S.S. 1600, Kālayukti; Madura; grant of the village of Krishṇāpuram to a Brahman by Muddu Alagiri Nāyuḍu, the grandson of Viśvanātha Nāyani—Tirumala Nāyuḍu, and the son of Muddu Vīrappa Nāyuḍu, in the reign of Śrī Vīrapratāpa Śrīranga Rāya Mahādēvarāja. (*S.C.P.*, No. 20.)

184. 1679.—Ś.S. 1601; Tirukkōshṭiyūr (Tiruppattūr, Ramnad); gift of land by Raghunātha Tirumalai Sētupati. (*I.M.P.*, ii, p. 1189.)

185. 1679.—Ś.S. 1601; Tiruvāḍānai; gift of lands to the Śiva temple by *Hiraṇyagarbha* Sētupati; two copper plate grants. (Sewell, i, p. 302.)

186. 1679.—Seringapatam; Chikkadēva Rāja; 'In the east, having conquered the Pāṇḍya King Chokka in battle, he captured the great Tṛpura and then the wealthly Anantapuri'. (*E.C.*, Mysore, I,S. R., No. 151.)

187. 1679.—Telugu; Ś.S. 1602, Siddhārti, Friday, the third lunar day which was Akshayatṛtīyā of the bright fortnight of Vaiśāka; in the presence of God Ranganātha, on the bank of the Chandrapushkaraṇi, Muddaḷāgādri Nāyaka, the son of Viśvanātha Nāyaka, granted, for the merit of his ancestors, with all the usual rites, the village Ārāmbanna of the revenue value of 600 *māḷḷuku*, situated on the bank of the Tāmraparṇi in the southern *rāshṭra*; and the stone *maṭha* situated to the west of the southern *gōpura* of the Chitra street of Rangakshētra (Śrīrangam) to the Raghupati treasury of Yōgīndra-tīrtha-śrīpāda-Oḍēyar, the son of Rāghavēndra-tīrtha-śrīpāda-Oḍēyar. This is a copper plate record from the Rāghavēndrasvāmi *maṭha* of Nanjangūḍ. (*Mysore Archaeological Report*, 1917, p. 57.)

188. 1680.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1601 expired, Siddhārti, Makara, Thursday; Rāmēśvaram; Raghunātha Sētupati Kātta Tēvar, the son of *Hiraṇyagarbhayājī* Raghunātha Sētupati Kātta Tēvar; grant of villages for festivals and offerings of Rāmanāthasvāmi, which were placed under the *mirās* of Raghunātha Gurukkal, the son of Śankara Gurukkal, whose fnnctions, privileges and honours are enumerated. (Burgess, Sētupati Grant, No. 8.)

189. 1682.—Tamil; Dundubhi; Aruppukkōṭṭai (Ramnad); Tirumalai Sētupatikātta Raghunāthatēvar; gift of land in the village of Bommakkōṭṭai for daily worship by his agent for his merit. (416 of 1914.)

190. 1683.—Tamil; K. Ā. 858, Durmukki (1656-7); Tinnevelly; a sale-deed by the chief of Vaṇṇikūḍam to the temple at Tinnevelly, in order to increase the merit of (*Puṇṇiyattukkāka*) Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka and Tiruvenginātbayyar. (*S.C.P.*, No. 167.)

191. 1684.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1606, K.Y. 4785, Raktākshi, Vaiyāśi, full-moon, Monday; Rāmēśvaram; *Hiraṇyagarbhayaji* Raghunātha Sētupati Kātta Tēvar; grant to God Eḷuvāpurīśvarar and Goddess Akhilanḍēśvarī in Kāḷaiyārkōvilśīmai, in Tennāla-nadu, of the three villages of Pudukkōṭṭai, Kaḷḷikkuḍi and Eḍayanvāyal. (Burgess, Sētupati Grant, No. 9.)

192. 1686.—Ś.S. 1608; Arumbāvūr (Perambalūr, Trichinopoly); (Ranga Krishṇa) Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka; repairs to a sluice during his reign (Sewell, i, p. 263.)

193. 1686.—Paṭṭukkōṭṭai (Tanjore), in the ruined fort; Shahji 'conquered all the Paṭṭukkōṭṭai country inhabited by *Kaḷḷans* extending to the south as far as the Pāmbanār'. (*Tanjore Gazetteer*, i, p. 253.)

194. 1686.—Seringapatam; Chikkādēvarāja Uḍaiyār defeated the army of the Lord of Madhura in the Īrōḍu country and took Tṛpura and Anantapuri; slew Dāmaralayyapēndra and put Anantōji to flight, captured the elephant Kulaśēkhara, and took by assault Śāmbaḷḷi (Bhavāni, Coimbatore), Ōmalūr (near Salem), and Dhārāpuram. (*E.C.*, Mysore, I., S.R., No. 14.)

195. 1687.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1608 expired; Uyyakkonḍān Channel near Vēṭṭuvāyttalai (Trichinopoly); a record of

Mangammāḷ on a pillar at the head-sluice of the channel. (71 of 1890 ; *M.E.R.*, 1891, pp. 4 and 8.)

196. 1687. Prabhava ; Śrīrangam ; Annamuttammāl, the mother of Śrī Ranga Krishṇa Muttuvīrappa Nāyakar, gave two villages for God Ranganātha (*I.M.P.*, iii, p. 1571.)

197. 1691.—Telugu ; Ś.S. 1613, K.Y. 4792, Prajōtpatti ; Trichinopoly ; grant of land to a Brahman by Mangammāḷ, the widow of Chokkanātha. (*S.C.P.*, No. 47.)

198. 1692.—Telugu ; Ś.S 1614, Āngirasa ; Tinnevelly : grant to a Musalman for the maintenance of a mosque, during the reign of the sovereign Śrīranga Rāya at Kanakagiri, by Vijaya Ranga Chokkanātha, the son of Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa, 'who was the son of Chokkanātha, and grandson of Muttu Vīrappa, of the family of Viśvanātha Nāyaka' who was then 'in the Kingdom of Madura' (Madhurasamstānamānduvunḍi). (*S.C.P.*, No. 53.)

198.1692.—Telugu ; Ś.S. 1614, Śrīmukha ; Śrīrangam ; gift of land by Mangammāḷ, the Queen of Viśvanātha Nayaka-Chokkanātha Nāyaka. (12 of Appendix II, 1888 ; 25 of Appendix A, 1906.)

200. 1693.—Tamil ; Ś.S. 1 (6) 15, Śrīmukha, K. Y, 4794 ; Uttamapāḷaiyam (Periyakulam, Madura) ; gift of land by Mangammāḷ. (733 of 1905,)

201. 1695.—Ś.S.1617; Tinnevelly; a grant to the Tiruppuḍaimarudūr temple by the agents of Vijayaranga Chokkanātha Nāyaka. (*S.C.P.*, No. 202.)

202. 1695.—Ś.S. 1617, Yuva; Avanāśi; Chikkadēva Rāya Uḍaiyār; Guru Karimallayya, his Prime Minister, granted to the local God and Goddess the fees of fourteen *paṇams*, etc. (*I.M.P*, i, p. 523.)

203. 1695.—(July 11) Tamil; Ś.S., 1617, K. Ā.871, Āḍi 11, Thursday; Ambāsamudram; Vijayaranga Chokkanātha Nāyaka, the son of Ranga-Krishṇa-MnttuVīrappa Nāyaka and grandson of Chokkanātha Nāyaka; records *sarvamānya* grants made by a Pāṇḍya King in Ś. S. 1408, K. Ā. 661, Puraṭṭādi 20, Thursday, for daily worship, monthly and annual festivals, offerings and other requirements to the temple at Dakshiṇakāśi in Muḷḷi-nāḍu. (1 of Appendix A, 1919.)

204. 1697.—K. Ā. 873, Kārtikai 4; Vaḍaśēri (Agastīśvaram, Travancore); records remission of taxes to the people of Nāñjināḍ for thirteen years, on account of the Nāyak invasion. (V. Nagam Aiya, *The Travancore State Manual*, i, pp. 197-8 and 317-8.)

205. 1698.—Telugu; S.Ś. 1619, Īśvara, Māgha, Friday; Mangammagāru, the Queen of Viśvanātha Nāyaka-Chokkanātha Nāyaka, granted, with all the usual rights, the village of Āyirdharma; together with its hamlets, of the revenue value of 400 *mālluku*, situated in the *Śrīvalli-puttūru-śīmai* of her *Tiruchināpalli-rāshṭra*; and a *maṭha* with a *maṇḍapa*, a temple and a *Purāṇa-ghaṭṭa* in Śrīvalliputtūr to the Raghupati treasury of Sumatīndratīrtha-śrīpāda-oḍēyār.... (*Mysore Archaological Report*, 1917, p. 57.)

206. 1700.—Telugu; S. Ś. 1622, Vikrama, Tinnevelly; a grant to the Śiva temple at Tinnevelly by Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka in the reign of Rājādhirāja Narasimhadēva at Ghānagiri. (*S.C.P.*, No. 168.)

207. 1700.—Telugū; S.Ś. 1622, Vṛsha; Madura; grant of the village of Bālakrishṇa Mahādānapuram to certain Brahmans by 'Śrī Mangamma, wife of Chokkanātha Nāyuḍu, who was son of Muttu Vīrapya Nāyuḍu, and grandson of Viśvanātha Nāyani-Tirumala Nāyuḍu.' (*S.C.P.*, No. 19.)

208. 1700.—S. Ś. 1622; Tirumōgūr (Madura), Daḷavay Sētupati; repairs in the Śiva temple. (Sewell, i, p. 295.)

209. 1701.—Telugu; Ś. S. 1623, Vishu (Vṛsha); Madura; Mangammāḷ, the Queen of Viśvanātha Nāyaka-Chokkanātha Nāyaka; gift of land for a feeding institute (*annadāna*) to a certain Subbayya Bhāgavata, when 'Vīrapratāpa Vīra-Venkaṭadēva-Mahārāya was rulling at Ghānagiri' (Penukoṇḍa) with the imperial titles, Mahārājādhirāja and Paramēśvara. (3 of Appendix A, 1911; *M.E.R.*, 1911, pp. 89-90.)

210. 1701.—Telu gu; (Ś. S.) 1623, Vishu; Mangammāḷ, the Queen of Chokkanātha Nāyaka; gift of some villages near Trichinopoly to the *daraga* of Bābānatta. (19 of Appendix A, 1911; *M.E.R.*, 1911, pp. 89-90.)

211. 1704.—Telugu; Ś. S. 1626 current, Tāraṇa; Maruttuvakkuḍi (Pāpanāśam, Tanjore,) on a stone set up on the bank

of the *Uyyakkoṇḍān* Channel near the surplus sluice; Mangammagāru, the Queen of Viśvanāthanāyini-Chokkanāyinivāru: the construction of the sluice (*kalingulu*) by a Brāhmaṇa. (394 of 1907.)

212. 1706.—Telugu; Ś.S. 1628, Vyaya; Tinnevelly; a grant by Mangammāl, the widow of Chokkanātha Nāyaka, during the reign of Venkaṭadēva Rāya at Ghānagiri. (*S.C.P.*, No. 110.)

213. 1707.—Tamil; a copper plate inscription from the Vyāsarāya-*maṭha* of Sōsāle; registers the grant of certain taxes on the imports, exports, etc., of the kingdom by Vijaya Raghunātha Sētupati Kāttatēvar of Ramnad, on behalf on the *maṭha* to its agent at Rāmēśvaram. The king has the following titles:—Lord of Tēvanagara, Establisher of the Pāṇḍi-maṇḍala, Lord of Śembi-nāḍu, Creator of Raghunāthasamudra by damming the Vaigai, Lord of the Southern Ocean, Champion over three kings, etc. He is said to have his residence in Kāṭṭūr *alias* Kulōttunga-Śōlanallūr in Tūngāvūr kūṟṟam. He and his father, Raghunātha Sētupati Kāttatēvar, have the epithet *Hiraṇyagarbhayāji* added to their names. (*Mysore Archaeological Report*, 1912, p. 55.)

214. 1708.—Telugu; Ś.S. 1630, Vikriti (1710), Kārttika 15, Monday; Vīrapratāpa Venkaṭadēva-Mahārāya, ruling at Ghānagiri; grant of lands by Vijayaranga-Chokkanātha for the maintenance of worship, feeding of Brāhmaṇas, etc., in the Śankarāchārya-*maṭha* at Gajāraṇyakshētra (Jambukēśvaram). (4 of Appendix A, 1915.)

215. 1708.—Telugu; a copper plate from Vyāsarāya-*maṭha* of Sōsāle; records the grant of certain dues to the *maṭha* by the Lord of the Pāṇḍya throne, Vijaya Ranga Chokkanātha Nāyaka of the Kāśyapa-gōtra, the son of Rangakrishṇa-Mudduvīrappa Nāyaka, and grandson of Viśvanātha Nāyaka-Chokkanātha Nāyaka. Whatever dues were being paid in the Madura kingdom to the temple at Chokkanāthapura were to be paid to the *maṭha* also. (*Mysore Archaeological Report*, 1912, p. 55.)

216. 1710.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1632, Khara, Panguni 20, Saturday; Madura; Vijaya Ranga Chokkanātha, the son of

Muttu Vīrappa Nāyakkar; refers to a temple servant falling down from the top of the temple *gōpura* as a protest against undue collection of tax from four tax-free villages, and the yielding of the state officals. This is an interesting document which gives the names of the Daḷavāy, Pradhāni, the Commander of the Madura fort, the Samprati (accountant), the temple manager, and the members of the temple *panchāyat*. (Burgess, pp. 110-1, No. 24.)

217. 1710.—Ś.S. 1632; Madura; Vijaya Ranga Chokkanātha Nāyaka. (Sewell, i, p. 292.)

218. 1712.—(8th March)— Tamil, Ś.S. 1634, Khara, Panguni 10, Saturday; Madura; records remission of taxes on four villages granted to the bearers of the (image) of Śokkanāthasvāmin in the reign of Vijaya Ranga Chokkanātha Nāyaka, the son of Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka; mentions the Commander-in-Chief, Kumāra Daḷavāy Kat(s)tūri Rangayyan, and the Pradhāni, Venkaṭakrishṇayyan. (6 of 1915; *M.E.R.*, 1915, p. 116.)

219. 1712.—Same as No. 218.

220. 1713.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1635, Vijaya; Rāmēśvaram; Muttu Vijaya-Raghunātha Sētupati Kāttatēvar, who performed the *Hiraṇyagarbha ceremony;* gift of lands and houses at Attiyūttu to fourteen Brāhmaṇa families. (9 of Appendix A, 1911.)

221. 1714.—Ś.S. 1636,, Ētappūr (Āttūr, Salem); a sale deed in the reign of Doḍḍa Krishṇa Uḍaiyār. (Sewell, i, p. 201.)

222. 1715.—Ś.S. 1637, K.Ā. 887; Tinnevelly; private grant of land for the support of the temple in a village of the Tinnevelly district during the reign of Vijaya Chokkanātha. (*S.C.P.*, No. 11.)

223. 1715.—Ś.S. 1636 expired, Jaya, Chitrai 12, Monday; Rāmēśvaram; *Hiraṇyagarbhayāji* Vijaya Raghunātha Sētupati Kātta Tēvar, the son of *Hiraṇyagarbhayāji* Raghunātha Sētupati Kātta Tēvar; a grant for the maintenance of a charity. (Burgess, Sētupati Grant, No. 10.)

224. 1716.—Telugu; Ś.S. 1638; Śrīrangam; grant of land for a charity by Vijaya Ranga Chokkanātha, the son of

Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa, and grandson of Chokkanātha, when Śrī Vīra Ranga Rāya was reigning at Ghānagiri. (*S.C.P.*, No. 50.)

225. 1717.—Ś.S. 1639, Kārtikai 21; Madura; a copper plate grant of Vijaya Ranga Chokkanātha, recording the gift of a *maṭha* at Tirukkaḷukkuṉṟam (Chingleput). (The Madras Museum.)

226. 1718.—Ś.S. 1640; Taḷi (Hōsūr, Salem); the Gōpāla temple was built by Krishṇa Rāya Uḍaiyār of Maisūr. (Sewell, i, p. 195.)

227. 1719.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1641 expired, Vikāri; Tai 13, Wednesday; Madura; an agreement drawn up by eight merchants of the village of Vattilaikkūṇḍu, belonging to eight castes (ten classes of people) as the Kauṇḍans, Kōmiṭṭis, Muhammadans, etc., promising to give a share of their gains annually to support the ritual of their village temple. The grant was executed with the consent of the palace authorities, the Palace Agent, Kūlappa Nāyaka, Kāval Ettilappa Nāyaka, etc., when Vijaya Ranga Chokkanātha was in power at Madura. (*SC.P.*, No. 65-A; Burgess, pp. 89-90, No. 12.)

228. 1721.—Telugu; Ś.S. 1643, Śubhakrit (1722); Trichinopoly; a gift of rent-free land to a certain Narasa Pantulu 'to offer prayers to Dhanvantari' in the reign of Vijayaranga Chokkanātha Nāyaka, the son of Rangakrishṇa Muttuvīrappa Nāyaka, and grandson of Chokkanātha Nāyaka. (1 of Appendix A, 1911; *M.E.R.*, 1611, p. 90.)

229. 1722.—Seringapatam; Chikkadēva Rāja 'emulated the sports of Krishṇa in conquering the lord of Madura'. (*E.C.*, Mysore, *I.*, *S.R.*, No. 64.)

230. 1724.—Telugu; S.Ś. 1646, Krōḍhi; Tinnevelly; grant of a village in charity by Vijaya Ranga Chokkanātha during the reign of Mahādēva Rāya at Ghānagiri. (*S.P.C.*, No. 109)

231. 1727.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1649, K.Y. 4828, Parābhava; Trichnopōly; grant by 'Vijaya Chokka Ranganātha Nāyakan', the son of Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka, and grandson of Chokkanātha, to a Paṇḍāram (Śūdra priest) for

worship at a *Durgā-Kāḷi* temple at the southern gate of the Trichinopoly fort, when Venkaṭa Vēma Mahārāya was reigning at Kannakāma. (*S.C.P.*, No. 44.)

232. 1728.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1650, K.Y. 4829, Kīlaka; Tiruneḍungaḷam (Trichninopoly); gift of land for worship in the local temple by Vijayaranga Chokkanātha Nāyaka. (697 of 1909.)

233. 1729.—Ś.S. 1651, K. Y. 4830, Saumya; Madura; grant by Śinna Kadirappa Nāyakka, a chief residing near Dindigul, of a village called Bhūpālasamudra to a number of Puṇḍits in Saundararājapuram, otherwise called Ānaipaṭṭi during the reign of Vijaya Ranga Chokkaknātha, who was governing the country as Viceroy for the Vijayanagar sovereign Śrīranga Rāya. (*S.C.P.*, No. 33; Burgess, pp. 117-21, No. 27.)

234. 1731.—Ś.Ś, 1653, K.A. 907, Virōdhikrit; Tinnevelly; grant of house by certain persons to a female belonging to the Śiva temple in Tinnevelly for the maintenance of worship in the reign of Vijaya Ranga Chokkanātha. The deed is ornamented with Vaishnava figures. (*S.C.P.*, No. 56.)

235. 1733.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1655; Śamayavaram (Trichinopoly); a grant by 'Mīnākshi Rāṇi Ammāḷ', the wife of Vijaya Ranga Chokkanātha, during the reign of Śrī Vīra Venkaṭadēva Mahārāya at Ghanagirinagara. (Sewell, i, p. 267.)

236. 1733.—Telugu; Ś.S. 1654, K.Y. 4833, Pramādīcha; Trichinopoly; grant of land for a charitable object at the Trichinopoly fort-gate by Mīnākshi, the widow of Vijaya Ranga Chokkanātha, the son of Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa and grandson of Chokkanātha, when Venkaṭadēva was sovereign at Ghanagiri. (*S.C.P.*, No. 49.)

237. 1733.—Ś.S. 1655; Trichinopoly; grant of lands to a mosque by Mīnākshi. (Sewell, i, p. 268.)

238. 1734.—Ś.S. 1656; Tiruchchengōḍu; gifts of lands to the temple by Krishṇa Rāja Uḍaiyār of Maisūr. (Sewell, i, p. 203.)

239. 1735.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1656 expired, Ānanda (1734), Kārtikai, Aparapaksha-Trayōdaśi, Svāti, Monday; Rāmēśvaram; *Hiraṇyagarbhayājī* Kumāra Muttu Raghunātha Sētupati, the son of *Hiraṇyagarbhayājī* Raghunātha Sētupati; grant of villages to Vēlāyudhasvāmi of Palani. (Burgess, Sētupati Grant, No. 14.)

240. 1736.—Tamil; S.S. 1658, Naḷa; Madura; Muttu Kumāra Vijaya Rahunātha Sētupati, the son of Kumāra Muttu Vijaya Rahunātha, and son-in-law of *Hiraṇyagarbhayājī* Raghunatha Sētupati Kāttār; his grant of lands to a Brahman. (*S.C.P.*, No. 23.)

241. 1739.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1661, K.Y. 4841, Prabhava (1747); Trichinopoly; grant of lands to a Musalman priest for the maintenence of a *paḷḷivāśal* by one Kāmākshi Nāyaka, when Rāma Rāya was 'ruling over the world'. (*S.C.P.*, No. 43.)

242. 1744.—S.S. 1666; Hanumantaguḍi; Muttu Kumāra Vijaya Rnghunātha Sētupati; grant of lands to a Musalman. (Sewell, i, p. 298.)

243. 1750.—Ś.S. 1672; Dindigul; Daḷavāy Nārāyaṇappayya re-established certain temple villages in the reign of Vijaya Ranga Chokkanātha. (*I.M.P.*, ii, p. 992.)

244. 1756.—Kanarese; Ś.S. 1678, Dātri, K.Y. 4857; Avanāśi Krishṇarāja Vaḍēya of Mahīśūru ruling at Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇa; repairs in the temple. (201 of 1909.)

245. 1760.—Ś.S. 1682, Vikrama; Satyamangalam; Krishṇa Rāja Uḍaiyār; the villages of Guḍḍanāyakanpāḷaiyam, Tirumalai-Seṭṭipāḷaiyam, etc., were sold for 7,920 *pagoḍas* to Rāmāvadhāni and two other Brahmans. (*I.M.P.*, i, p. 551.)

246. 1760.—Ś.S. 1682; Koḷḷēgāl; Krishṇa Rāja Uḍaiyar of Maisūr; gift of land to the karnam's ancestors. (*Ibid.*, p. 553.)

247. 1760.—Ś.S. 1682, Vikrama; Coimbatore; Chikka Krishṇa Rāja; grant of lands in Puttūr and Kaṇiyūr villages. (*S.C.P.*, No. 189.)

248. 1762. Ś.S. 1684; Satyamangalam; Krishṇarāja Uḍaiyār; a sale-deed. (*I.M.P.*, i, p. 551.)

249. 1763.—Ś.S. 1685, K.Y. 4864, Subhānu; Ānaimalai (Poḷḷāchi, Coimbatore); Krishṇa Rāja Uḍaiyār at Srīrangapaṭṭaṇam; grant of land by Mādayya, the 'Agent of the Maisūr Rājas', to certain Brāhmaṇas. (*S.C.P.*, No. 171.)

250. 1765.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1687, K.Y. 4866, Pārthiva, Tai 4; Madura; Rāya Vijaya-Raghunātha Tonḍaimānār, ruling over the Madurai-nāḍu; grant of land at Kāraippaṭṭi for certain services and charities to be conducted at the time of the festivals of the God Bāla Subrahmaṇya on the Paḷni hill. (22 of Appendlx A, 1918.)

251. 1771.—Ś.S. 1693; Tinnevelly; grant of land to the Śiva temple at Karivalamvandanallūr by Rāmalinga Nāyaka, acting under orders of Navāb Āsād Siyāl, who assumes royal titles, (*S.C.P.*, No. 201.)

252. 1797.—Tamil; Ś.S. 1719, Pingala, K.Y. 4898; Nāraṇapuram (Palladam, Coimbatore); Pallaḍagrāmam in Vaṛākka-nāḍu, a sub-division of Kongumanḍalam; a grant by the Śeṭṭis, referring to the rule of the Vijayanagar kings, the Nāyaks of Madura—Viśvanātha, Tirumala etc. (1 and 2 of Appendix A, 1910; *M.E.R.*, 1910, p. 10.)

Miscellaneous and Undated Inscriptions

253.—Kāyattūr (Kōvilpaṭṭi, Tinnevelly); grant of lands in the 'Kaittār' province to Irunkōḷ Piḷḷai, the chief of Kōrkai, on account of his having settled a boundary dispute, by Vijaya Ranga Chokkalinga Nāyaka. (*S.C.P.*, No. 57.)

Note.—The date given in the inscription, i.e., Ś.S. 1549, K.Ā. 803 (1627), does not agree with the accepted reign-period of Vijaya Ranga Chokkanātha, the Nāyak of Madura.

254.—Mukkaṇānkurichchi (Karur, Trichinopoly); records that Karemakavuṇḍan and others fixed an allowance of one *patāka* of grain and two *paṇams* to the God for each marriage in the reign of Viśvanātha Nāyakar. (*I.M.P.*, iii, p. 1510.)

255.—Tamil; Kīḻakkarai (Ramnad); mentions Achyu(ta)rāya and Tummuśi Nāyakkar. (398 of 1907; *I.M.P.*, ii, p. 1167.)

Note.—The date given, viz. Ś.S. 146(.), would be between 1538 and 1547.

256.—Grantha; Ś.S. 1515, Vijaya; Kilakkarai; Jaṭilavarman Śrī Vallabha; grant in his thirtieth year of the renamed Peddappa Nāyakasamudram to sixty-nine Brāhmaṇas at the request of the chief, Ayyankārappa, the son of Peddappa and grandson of Nāgama Nāyaka, who bears the titles of Mōkālipaṭṭavardhana and Kānchimahāpurādhīśa. (1 of Appendix A, 1912; *M.E.R.*, 1912, p. 66.)

257.—Śrīvilliputtūr (Ramnad); Viśvanātha Nāyaka, Vīrappa Nāyaka, and Krishṇappa Nāyaka built the temple of Krishṇasvāmi, set up the idols of Rukmiṇi, Satyabhāmā, and Krishṇa, and granted a portion of land (*I.M.P.*, ii, p. 1183.)

Note.—The cycle year given, viz. Bhava, may be 1574.

258.—Kīranūr (Paḷni, Madura); Kāḷahastiyappa Mudaliyār, the Prime Minister of Viśvanātha Nāyaka, and the *kauṇḍans* of twenty-four *nāḍs* granted the village as a free gift to Brahmans in the reign of Viśvanātha Nāyakar. (*I.M.P.*, ii, p. 1023)

259.—Rāmēśvaram; the ruined *prākāra* was first repaired by Rāmanātha, the prince of sages, well versed in all the rites and *āgamas* of the Śaiva system. (Burgess, p. 58, No. 7.)

Note.—The cyclic year mentioned in the inscription, viz. Kālayukti, may be 1618.

260.—Rāmēśvaram; the silver swinging cot in the *Paḷḷiyarai* was the gift of Vijaya Raghunātha Sētupati Kātta Tēvar, the son of *Hiraṇyagarbhayājī* Raghunātha Sētupati Kātta Tēvar. (*Ibid.*, p. 60, No. 13.)

261.—Tamil; Brahmadēśam (Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly); the building of the *gōpura* for the merit of Vīrappa Nāyaka, the son of Viśvanātha Nāyaka-Krishṇappa Nāyaka. (377 of 1916.)

APPENDIX E

' Maduraittala — Varalaru '

(*Account of the Sacred city of Madura*)

After Śiva and his son Ugra, Kulaśēkhara obtained the throne on the expiry of forty lakhs, sixty-five thousand, and six-hundred and fifty years. Thus from the days of Kulaṣēkhara-Pāṇḍya to the days Parākramapāṇḍya 'who sleeps with the wakeful sword'[1] the place enjoyed Pāṇḍyan rule. During the Kaliyuga, Śalivāhana Śaka 1246, five-hundred and one years after the destruction of Kollam in the month of Āni of the year Rudhirōdgāri[2] the Ādisultan Malukkunēmiyān came from Delhi, and having captured and sent Parākramapāṇḍya to Delhi took possession of the place. For a period of three years from Rudhirōdgāri Āvaṇi to Krōdhana the region from the Himalayas to Sētu was under Muslim sway, (tulukkāṇiyam), and after a state of hostility wihout anyone's gaining a clear ascendency, Ulāpatikhan came in the year Akshaya, and ruled for a period of six years till Prajōtpatti (A.D. 1326-31). Then Ulāpatikhan ruled the place for a period of three years from Āngirasa to the year Bhava (A. D. 1332-34). Then his nephew Kuḍipatik ruled from the year Yuva to Pramātīcha. (A.D. 1335-39.)[3]

After this one Nagalatik ruled from the month of Āḍi in the year Vikrama to the year Vijaya (A.D. 1340-53). Then Savaudma-

[1] The expression is queer, and may be an erroneous transcript of a well-known title of Jāṭavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya '*Vāḷāl-Vaḷitirandān*', he that opened the way with the sword. *South India and her Muhammadan Invaders*, p. 53 Note i.

[2] This corresponds to the year A.D. 1323-24, the month Āni would make it the year 1323 A.D., June—July. This would correspond to K.Ā. 498 whereas the date given is 501 expired.

[3] The dates are in error being earlier than the actual years by about five years. The name of the second ruler Kuḍipatik leaves little doubt that the dynasty under reference is that founded by Sharif-Jalalu-d-din Ahsan-Shah. He ruled for five years A.D. 1335-40 and was followed for a year by Alau-d-din Udauaji. Then Qutubu-d-din for forty days in A. H. 740 (1339-40). The two Ulāpatikhans of the Tamil accounts seem to stand for the first two. The length of the reign of the three is wrong separately. The difference is made up with the third.

lukkan and Āṭṭumarugan ruled from the year Sarvajit to the year Viḷambi (A.D. 1347-58). After this Pungatik Malukkan ruled the kingdom from the year Vikāri to the year Sādhāraṇa (A.D. 1359-70). For a period of forty-eight years from Śaka 1246-93 the place had been under Musalman sway;[1] the god of the place went to Nānjilnāḍu and the Panjāksharatirumadil, the enclosing wall named after the five letters, the five mystic letters composing the name of Śiva, namely *Ōm Namaśivāya*, and the fourteen gōpuras, (gateways) as well as the streets were pulled down. The sanctum of the Nāyagar (Lord) temple, the *ardhamanḍapam* (the inner hall), and the *mahāmaṇdapam* (the outer hall) alone escaped destruction.

Thus when the land was under the Muslim domination in the year 1293 current, Virōdhikṛt, A.D. 1371 Kampaṇa Uḍaiyar, commander of the guards of the Mysore ruler,[2] having defeated and driven off the Musalmans, took possession of the kingdom and opened all the temples of Śiva and Vishṇu. When he opened the door of the sanctum of Tiruvālavāyuḍaiyanāyanār, however, he noticed with surprise that the lamp lighted (before the temples were closed) and the garland (placed on the images) were exactly like those that they placed on the God only the previous night. As soon as Kampaṇa Uḍaiyār saw this miracle he slapped himself on the cheek as an expiation for the offence, and after much devotional worship to the God granted several *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal* villages (villages granted to the temple), several jewels, and grants for the daily offerings. Thus he and his son Empana Uḍaiyār (Hēunanna) and his nephew (or son-in-law) Porkāśuḍaiyār ruled for a period of thirty-three years from the

1 THE SULTANS OF MADURA

I. Sharif Jalalu-d-din Ahsan Shah
coin. Jalalu-d-dunya Wad-d-din dated A.H. 738 also 739 and 40.

II. Alau-d-din Udauji or Uduji
Alau-d-dunya Wa-d-din, Udauji Shah, date A.H. 740

III. Qutbu-d-din Firoz Shah, A.H. 740.
Qutbu-d-d-dunya Wa-d-din

IV. Ghiyathu-d-din Muhammad Dama-ghan Shah, date A.H. 741

V. Nasiru-d-din, Mahmud Ghazi Damaghan Shah, A.H. 745.
Break, 745-757

VI. Adil Shah, A.H. 757

VII. Fakhru-d-din Mubarak Shah. Muhammad Mustafa legend Nasifu-n-nabi, date A.H. 761-770

VIII. Alau-d-din Sikandar Shah, A.H. 774-9

J.R.A.S., 1909, pp. 667-683.

2 Mysore, as a state, was not then in existence, but the writer is apparently referriug to his time. Kampaṇa's officc must have reference to the Hoyśala ruler of the time.

year Virōdhikṛt to the year Chitrabhānu (A.D. 1371-1402). During their days they made many a provision for all the Śiva and Vishṇu temples for jewellery and daily offerings for the Gods.

Then from the year of Subhānu of Śaka 1327 current to the year Vibhava (A.D. 1403-48) Lakkaṇanāyakkar and Madana Nāyakkar ruled for a period of forty-seven years.

Then in the year Śukla 1374 Saka current Lakkaṇa Nāyakkar brought out of retirement the son of the concubine of the Pāṇḍyan king Abhirāmi of Kāḷaiyārkōvil-Sundarattoḷ - Māvalivāṇādirāyar, Kāḷiyār Somanār, Anjādāperumāḷ Muttaraśar, and, crowning him in the days of Tirumalaimāvali Vāṇādirāyar as the son born of the Pāṇḍyan king with the deference due to the ancient royal family, gave him possession of the kingdom for forty-eight years.[1]

Then in the year Pingala[2] (A.D. 1497) Vaikāśi of Śaka 1422 current Narasayyanāyakkar came, offered worship at Rāmēśvaram and also captured the fort. Tennanāyākkar ruled for fifteen years from the month of Āvaṇi of this year to Āngirasa, A.D. 1512. Then from Śrīmukha (A.D. 1513) of the year Śaka 1437 current to Dhātu (A.D. 1517) for a period of four years one Nāchiapiḷḷai ruled the kingdom. Afterwards Kurukuru Timmappanāyakkar ruled from Īśvara to Vishnu for five years (A.D. 1517-21). Then from Śaka 1446 current from Chitrabhānu to Subhānu, for two years A.D. 1521-23 Kaṭṭiyam Kāmaiyanāyakka ruled. From Tāraṇa to Sarvajit (A.D. 1524-27) Chinnappanāyakka ruled for a period of four years. Īyakkarai Vaiyappanāyakkar ruled for a period of five years from the year Sarvadhāri to the year Nandana (1527-32). From the year Vijaya ro the year Vibhava[3] A.D. 1533-42 for a period of nine years Viśvanāthanāyakaraiyan ruled the kingdom. Varada ruled in the year Śubakṛt (A.D. 1542-43). Tumbichchināyakkar ruled from the year Śubakṛt to the year Krōdhi (A.D. 1543-44), Kārtigai, for a period of a year. Viśvanathanāyakaraiyan ruled from Krōdhi Mārgāḷi to the year Viśvāvasu (A.D. 1544-45) for a period of a year and seven months. One Viṭṭalarāja ruled from Prabava to the year Pingaḷa (A.D. 1546-57). The three kings Timmappanāyakkar,

[1] This passage is obscure in the original; the first name is that of the illegitimate son of the Pāṇḍya; the next name and the next which I prefer to take as one name *Anjādaperumāḷ Muttaraśar*, these three in succession ruled for forty-eight years apparently. Lakkaṇa's coronation refers only to his installation of the first.

[2] There is a discrepancy in the date. The year Pingaḷa is A.D. 1497 and Śaka 1422 is A.D. 1500. The Cyclic year is likely, it seems to me, to be correct and the Śaka year wrong.

[3] This ought to be Sōbhakrit.

Chellappanāyakkar and Paṭṭukōṭṭai-Vīrappanāyakkar, ruled from Kālayukti to Raudri Kārtigai (A.D. 1558-60). From Śaka 1446 to Śaka 1485 (A.D. 1524-63) twenty-seven persons ruled in Madura.

During the Saka 1481 (A.D. 1559) current Raudri (A.D. 1560), Mārgali, Viśvanathanāyakkar, son of Kōṭṭiyam Nāgamanāyakkar came under the orders of the Rāyar to Madura and died after a rule of twelve years extending from Raudri Mārgaḷi to Āngirasa Vaikāśi, A.D. 1559-72. From the month of Āni of the above year to Vaikāśi of Vishu (A.D. 1572-81); a period of nine years, Krishnappanāyaka, son of Viśvanāthanāyaka, ruled and died. From Āni of the above year to the year Manmatha Vaikāśi, A.D. 1581 to 1595, Vīrappanāyaka, the son of Krishṇappanāyaka, ruled the kingdom for a period of fourteen years. For seven years from the above year to Śubhakṛt Āni (A.D. 1595-02) Kumārakrishṇappanāyakka, son of Vīrappanāyakka, ruled and died. From Puraṭṭāśi of the year to Plavanga A.D. 1602-07 Māśi for a period of five years Visvanāthanāyakā, the brother of Kumārakrishṇappanāyakka, ruled and died. His brother Kastūrirangappanāyakka died just eight days after he came to the throne in the prayer hall (*Sanḍhyāmanḍapam*) on the other side of the river, Muttukrishṇappanāyakkar, son of the above, ruled from Panguni of tne above year till Dundubhi Kārtigai (A.D. 1608-22), for a period of fifteen and three-fourth years and died. On the seventh of Mārgaḷi of the year Dundubhi Muttutirumalanāyakkaraiyan, brother of Muttuvīrappanāyakkar, became very deserving of the grace of Mīnākshisundarēśvara and made several gifts of jewellery, built 'the New Manḍapa' and a tank for the annual floating festival, constructed a gold-plated throne, an ivory worked car, a great stone seat and a throne set with rubies. He ordered several structures to be made to the seven great temples, gifted land with an income of 44,000 pon for the daily worship, and tax-free villages for the maintenance of servants and managers. He further made his individual daily gift of food and conducted the festivals on a grand scale. He constructed a new car for the Aḷagar for his Chaitra festival and made the temple celebrated. Whenever he personally came for purposes of worship he used to give a votive offering of 1,000 pon as *pādakāṇikkai* for worship and offerings. If the god be taken in procession in Māśivīdi he used to offer 1,000 pon. In this manner having ruled for a period of thirty-six years from the year Dundubi Māśi 7th to the year Viḷambi Māśi 4th A.D. 1623-1659 he died on the night of the Tuesday of the year Viḷambi Māśi 4th. From the month of Panguni of the year Viḷambi A.D. 1659 to Vaikāśi of Vikāri for a period of three months Muttuvīrappa Nāyaka ruled the place. For twenty-four years from Āni of Vikāri (A.D. 1659) Chokkanāthanā-

yakkar, son of Muttuvīrappanāyakka, ruled. He died on the 4th of Āni.

His son Rangakrishṇamuttuvīrappanāyakkar then ruled from Rudhirodgāri (A.D. 1683) 17th Arpiśi to the year Pramōdūta (A.D. 1690) for a period of seven years. Then his son Vijaya Rangamuttuchokkanāthanāyakkaraiyan being a child, his grand-mother ruled the kingdom for some time, with him in her lap. At this period, in the foundation of the Brahman settlements (*agrahārapratishṭai*) and the founding and patronage of the choultries, divine and Brahmin gifts, he conducted the administration as in the days of Tirumalanāyakka. After the death of Mangammaḷ, Vijayarangamuttu Chokkanātha during his rule managed the affairs of the kingdom exactly as in the days of Tirumalaināyakka. As things were going on in this manner, once in the course of his round of visits in the city *incognito* he noticed that the temple worship, offerings, and services were not being properly conducted, and went back to the palace. The next day he sent for all the temple management and establishment (*sthalattār* and *parijanattār*) and others, and enquired why the temple should have become so miserably poor in spite of his gifts of lands yielding 44,000 pon. He grew very angry as no satisfactory explanation was given and confiscated the lands under the control of the temple-management (*sthalattā*r) to the government, sent for the mortgage deeds of the temple-management, and settled and gave out of the royal treasusy 44,000 pon for the seven temples for purposes of daily worship (*pūja*), annual festival, monthly and other festivals, and also ordered the provision of a processional car for the Chaitra festival. He also made grants of tax-free villages as in the days of Tirumalanāyakka for management, for worship, for offerings of food, and arranged for the proper management of the temple affairs.

After having ruled for forty years he died on the night of Śivarātri in the month of Māśi of the year Virōdhikṛt (A.D. 1731). From Virōdhikṛt Māśi to Siddhārti Vaikāśi (A.D. 1731-39) for the period of nine years Mīnākshi Ammaḷ, the wife of Vijayarangachokkanāthanāyakar, crowned herself and ruled along with her brother Venkataperumāḷ Nāyakkar.

On the night of Tuesday, 30th of Vaikāśi Śaka 1668 (A.D. 1739) of Siddhārti, Vijayakumāramuttutirumalaināyakkar, son of Bangāru Tirumalaināyakkar, and Veḷḷaiyan-Śērvaikkāran of the Sētupati's guard moved out on news reaching that Chandēkhan-Baḍēkhan hadcaptured Dindigal. Immediately after the temple-management with all the attendants, removed the

gods Mīnākshi-Sundarēśvara and Kūḍal-Aḷagar (*Vishṇu*) to Vānaravīramadura (*Mānāmadurai*) and remained there for two years. The Sētupati provided for the *pūja* and the daily offering of the god and also supplied the whole establishment with food and drink, and kept them under his protection for a period of two years from Āni of Siddhārti to Āni of Durmukhi. Meanwhile Dēśing-Rāja reached Trichinopoly fort with 60,000 horse, surrounded it, killed Baḍēkhan removed all the Muslims and appointed Murārirao with instructions to restore the grants as usual, without any disturbance to the divine services, to all the Śiva and Vishṇu temples. He then retired towards the north. Afterwards Murārirāyar who was charitably disposed despatched Appāji Rāyar with 2,000 horse, and as he did not like to stay in a city without its God, he started for Vānaravīramadura. Having worshipped the God there and obtaining the consent of the Sētupati he returned to Madura with the God an hour after nightfall on Saturday, the 17th of Āni of Durmukhi year (A.D. 1741).

As usual in the Karnātaka days of Hindu rule he provided for the purificatory ceremonies of the temple (śānti and samprōkshaṇa), and amply provided for the daily worship and services of the god in due form.

In the year of Rudhirōdgāri, Śaka 1664 current (A.D. 1743), the Musalman Nizam (Nizamu-l-mulk) came from the north, captured the forts of Trichinopoly and Madura, and went back to the north having placed them in charge of two persons Mafus Khan and Muhammad-Ali Khan as Nawabs. They ruled the country for a period of ten years and six months, from Rudhirōdgāri to the 31st of Kārtigai of Āngirasa (A.D. 1743-53) as a Muhamadan possession (tulukkāṇiyam). During this period in the days of Abdul-Kumukhan (Abdul-RahimKhan?) of Madura fort, Mayana's brother-in-law, Alam-Khan, came with 2,000 horse through the land of Toṇḍaimān, and took possession of the Madura fort. He ruled for a year as far as the frontiers of Tiruvaḍi (Travancore), and placed Mayana in charge of Madura when he proceeded to Trichinopoly to join the forces of Chandēkhan (Chanda Sahib). Almukhān (Alamkhan) himself died in the disturbance that followed. Muhammadali (Muhammad Ali) put to flight Chandē Khan's forces and beheaded Chandē Khan himself.

Meanwhile Mayana, having sold possession of Madura fort to the Mysoreans so as to round off Mysore territory, retired to Tirumōhūr. After this Kuhu (or Kuku) Sahib of Mysore[1] entered the

[1] 'Khub Saheb Jamedar of the Mysoreans' according to the Nawab Muhammad Ali of Trichinopoly. Country Correspondence No. 422 of 1754. See page 31 N. 1. S.C. Hill's *Yusuf-Khan*.

fort on 30th the of Puraṭṭāśi of the Āngirasa year A.D. 1752. Hearing that the Mysoreans had taken possession of Madura, Veḷḷaiyan Śērvaikkāran, commander of the Sētupati's guard, and Tāṇḍavarāya Piḷḷai, *pradhāni* of the Udayadēvar's (Zamindar of Śivaganga) guard, surrounded the Madura fort in great force. Having stood a siege from the 30th of Puraṭṭāśi to the 26th of Kārtigai of the year (A.D. 1752) Kuhu-Sahib, as a result of arbitration, left the fort in charge of the Sētupati and retired in the direction of Dindigal.

As matters were in a state of confusion from the year Rudhirōdgāri to the year Āngirasa (A.D. 1743-52), in Kali 4853 Śal.Śaka 1673 current, 16th of Kārtigoi (A.D. 1651) of the Āngirasa year, both Veḷḷaiyan-Śērvaikāran, the commandant of the Sētupati's guard and Tāṇḍavarāya Piḷḷai of Udaya-Dēvar's guard entered the Mudura fort, threw open the temples, conducted the services, and arranged for worship as usual; and as Kuhu Sahib had slaughtered several cows and done other unworthy acts during the siege they ordered the necessary purificatory ceremonies to be performed to the several temples. Being unwilling to see a state without its King, they sent for Vijaya Kumāramuttutirumalaināyakka, son of Bangāru-Tirumalai Nāyakkaraiyan from Veḷḷikurichchi and crowned him king on Monday, 14th of Mārgaḷi of the year Āngirasa in the Sanctum of the goddess (*nāchchiyār Sannadhi*), invested him with the sceptre and took him to the palace.

Then, when he had ruled the kingdom for sixteen months, from the 14th of Māśi of Āngirasa to the 30th of Vaikāśi of the year Śrīmukha, Mayana, Mahadimiya, and Nabikhan,[1] these three, sent the ruler out of the fort to Veḷḷikurichchi, took possession of the Madura fort and the country around. As usual they confiscated the temple lands, destroyed the trade of the merchants of the city, the gardens and the wells. While this was going on Kuhusahib of Mysore returned with Veḷḷaiyan Śērvaikāran, surrounded the fort, and closely besieged the place for six months, with their headquarters camp under the banyan close to Panaiyūr. The forces of Mayana however, drove off Vēḷḷaiyan Śērvaikaran and Kuhusahib, killing them in the affray, and took possession of the fort of Madura, and maintained themselves in it from Āni of Srīmukha to the 21st of Māśi of the year Bhava (A.D. 1753-55). Meanwhile in Kali 4855 Śaka 1675 current, Bhava 22nd of Māśi Mafus Khan Sahib started with 1,000 Europeans and twenty guns from Dēvanāmpaṭṭaṇam, and, coming through the pass of Nattam, took possession of the

[1] Mahamad Barkey (Mianah of Orme), Mahamad Mainach (Moodemiah), Nabikhan Cattack.

Madura fort. As the Tirumōhūr temple in which Mayana stayed was used as a fort, the Europeans entered it and took possession of the jewellery of the god and the idols, and returned to Madura.

Then they advanced as far as Tinnevelly and returned to Madura. Finally returning to Trichinopoly they carried the idols of Tirumōhūr on the backs of camels. On their march to Aḷagar-kōvil the native Kaḷḷars fell upon them, took possession of the idols, and restored them to the temple. Some time after when Barakadulla otherwise Danishmund Khan (*vide* page 40 of N. 2 S.C. Hill *Yusuf Khan*) was exercising power at Madura in behalf of Mafuskhan, a Muhammadan fakir came and erected his tent (*niśan*) in front of the Pudumanḍapa of Tirumalai Nāyakka; and as he was making preparations to build a double brick wall with a view to hoist a flag on the platform of the gopura of the temple, the whole body of the temple officials, the local merchants, and other inhabitants, all met together and made every effort to make him desist. In spite of their protest he refused to get down from the gōpura, as it was a time of anarchy without authority to compel obedience. The temple management then closed the four gates of the gōpura, and, entering the temple, remained inside. In this state of affairs the eye of the image of Vādāḍum Bhadrakaḷi Amman, in the South-eastern corner of the golden pillar of the Assembly Hall (āsthāna manḍapam) opened on the 3rd of Tai, about an hour after daybreak and remained open till about daybreak on the 5th of of the same month. This occurance of the miracle soon circulated in all directions, and people flocked to the place as on festival days, and marvelled at the occurrence. Then in the month of Chittirai of the year Īśvara (A.D. 1757), Khan Sahib Commandant who had gone to Tinnevelly surrounded Madura with 1,000 Europeans of Dēvanāmpattanam and the fort was besieged in the month of Chittirai to Āvaṇi. People were put to much trouble and Barakdulla, who remained in the fort, descended the walls of the fort and reached Tribhuvanam.[1] Both Kanusahib (Khan Sahib) and Muttaḷagu Piḷḷai son of Minākshinātha Piḷḷai of Tiriśirapuram (Trichinopoly) fort went round the city and the temple gates. He sought the presence of Khansahib and impressed him that the temples of the city being very ancient deserved to be treated in customary Karnatic Hindu fashion. Then the lands of the temple were restored to 'the Seven temples', the necessary purificatory cere-

1 This obviously refers to the attack and and capture of Madura by Caillaud and Yusufkhan in A.D. 1757. But the Mindankhan or Maindan Khan of the Pānḍyan chonicle is Khumandan Khan Sahib of this, and stands for Commandant Khan Sahib which stands again for Yusuf Khan. See Ch. VI of *Yusuf Khan.*

monies were performed to the gods and the temple of Tiruālavāi (the great Śiva temple). The tent (*niśan*) of the fakir at the Rāya-gōpuram was pulled down and the fakir himself driven, after sound beating, beyond the mound outside the town. To the daily service of the gods, the processional car, festivals, etc., 12,000 pon was given at the rate of 1,000 pon for a month in addition to the grant of villages for the temple service and food offerings. As it was going on in this manner the Europeans of Pondicheri (the French) and those of Dēvānāmpattanam (Fort St. David) got into a state of hostility, and as the Puduchēri Europeans (the French) were in possession of the Fort St. David territory as far as Trichinopoly, Khan Sahib and Muttḷagu Piḷḷai proceeded from here to Trichinopoly and destroyed the French, and took possession of the country in their occupation. On reaching Fort St. David, the captain conferred on them all honours and gave them rewards. They then returned to Madras in the month of Vaikāśī of the Pramādi year (A.D. 1759).

From the year Chitrabhānu 1712 the temple managers took charge of the lands and provided 1,000 pon a year for the temple worship. From Subhānu Puraṭṭāśī, to Puraṭṭāśi of Tāraṇa, A.D. 1763-64, Colonel Preston of Madras with many Europeans along with Nawabs Muhammad Ali Khan Shib and Mafus Khan Sahib, Sētupati, Udaya-Dēvar (Śivaganga), the Tonḍaimān, and other Polegars laid siege to Madura. In the 3rd of Aippaśi, Tāraṇa of Śaka 1684 current A.D. 1764, Muhammad Ali Khan Sahib entered the fort having captured and hanged Muhammad Yusuf Khan. Then the temple management and all the principal residents went in a body to meet him. The revenue officer (Amil) Abdul Khan of Madura received orders to provide the seven temples with 7,000 pon a year, and lands and villages were granted likewise, and a sum of Rs. 500 was given for the purificatory ceremony of the temple. In this manner the government of Abdul Khan Sahib lasted for seven years from Tāraṇa to Vikṛti (A.D. 1764-70). From Kara to Hēviḷambi (A. D. 1770-77), Mohidin-Sahib's government lasted. The government of Mallāri Rayar (Malhari Rao) lasted for—(?) Then Dubash Venkaṭeśvara Mudaliyār undertook to provide for the temple worship and conducted the temple service with 6,000 pon.

The government of Kadar Sahib lasted for a year in Viḷambi (A. D. 1778). Kayala-Behu-Khan Sahib's government lasted for a year in Vikāri (A. D. 1779). From Śārvari to Plava (A.D. 1779-81), Mallāri Rāyar's government lasted for two years. For three years from Śubhakrt to Krōdhi (A. D. 1781-84) in the days of Master Dorien, the temple worship was conducted under the control of

Venkaṭa Rāyar with 6,000 pon as determined before, and all necessary temple grants and villages were made as before. In the year Viśvāvasu (A.D. 1785), Segu Muhammad Sahib carried on the government as a revenue officer on his own resposibility. In Plavanga A.D. 1787 Ramaswami Ayyan enjoyed power. Subbarāyar was in possession of power from Kīlaka to Saumya, Māśi (A.D. 1788-89). From Panguni of Saumya to Sādhāraṇa Āvaṇi (A.D. 1789-90) Ramaswami Ayyan enjoyed power. From Puraṭṭāśi A. D. 1790 it came into possession of the Company and master Macleud (Alexander Macleud) till Virōḍhikṛt 1791. During his days things were conducted according to the *parvana* of the Nawab. Then Khader Sahib exercised power in the year Paritāpi (1792). For the next two years from Pramātīcha to Ānanda 1793-94 Ramaswami Ayyan exercised power. For the next two years Rākshasa and Naḷa 1794-95 Treasurer Venkaṭarāyar exercised power.

For two years Pingaḷa and Kālayukti (A.D. 1797–98) Ramaswami Ayyan exercised power. In the year Siddhārti A.D. 1799 Ravo Pandit was in power. In Raudri Nārāyṇarāyar was in power. Till then the temple was conducted as usual with regard to villages granted for expenses, for general management, and those for food supply. From Raudri Āni to Durmukhi Āḍi 23rd, A.D. 1801 Rangarāyar exercised power on behalf of Mir Astakhan Bahadar. They also conducted religious worship according to custom. Then from 24th Āḍi of Durmuki (A.D. 1801) the Honourable Company obtained power and conducted things according to *māmūl.*

In Śaka 1723 Kali 4 (90) 2, Durmukhi Āḍi, 24th, the land coming under the possession of the Company, Collector Mēlur Artis Sahib (Thomas Bower Hurdis) came to Madura. Sub-officer M.R.Ry. Kyana Sahib and Peishkar Bhīma Rāyar, and Nārāyaṇa Rāyar, Peishkar of Madura, came to the place. Division officer Kyana Sahib arrived on the 25th. As the whole land was in the possession of the company Kyana Sahib held court in the Palace Hall. Everyone paid respect to them and obeyed their rule.

N.B.—This chronicle in quaint Tamil was translated, in the first instance, by Mr R. Gopalan, M.A., University Research Student. I revised it throughout, and added the notes.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES QUOTED AND REFERRED TO

1. Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Reports.
2. Bertrand, Father J., *La Mission du Maduré*, 4 vols., 1847-54.
3. Besse, Léon, *La Mission du Maduré*, Trichinopoly, 1914.
4. Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*.
5. Burgess, Jas. and Natesa Sastri, Pundit S. M., *Tamil and Sanskrit Inscriptions*. (Archaeological Survey of Southern India, iv, 1886.)
6. Caldwell, Bishop R., *History of Tinnevelly*, 1881.
7. *Census of India, Report*, 1901.
8. Chandler, The Rev. J. S., *The Jesuit Mission in Madura*, 1909.
9. Danvers, F. C., *Report on the Portuguese Records Relating to The East Indies*, 1892, India Office, London.
10. Danvers, F. C., *The Portuguese in India*, 2 vols., 1894.
11. Duff, James Grant, *A History of the Mahrattas*, 3 vols , 1912 (R. Cambray & Co., Calcutta).
12. Elloit, Sir H., *History of India*, 8 vols.
13. *Epigraphia Indica*.
14. *Epigraphia Carnataca*.
15. Fergusson, James, *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture*, 2 vols.
16. Ferishta (Scott's edition, 2 vols.)
17. Grose, J. H., *A Voyage to the East Indies*.
18. Hill, S. C., *Yusuf Khan, the Rebel Commandant*, 1914.
19. Hough, J., *History of Christianity*, 5 vols.
20. *Indian Antiquary*.
21. Kaye, J. W. *Christianity in India*.

22. Kincaid, C. A. and Parasnis, Rao Bahadur D. B., *A History of the Maratha People*, i, 1918.

23. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar, Prof. S., *Sources of Vijayanagar History*, 1919, University of Madras.

24. Kuppuswami Sastri, T. S., *A Short History of the Tanjore Nāyak Princes*, 1903.

25. Langlois, Ch. V. and Seignobos, Ch., *Introduction to the Study of History*, 1898.

26. Lockman, John, *Travels of the Jesuits*, 2 vols., 1762.

27. Madras Department of Epigraphy, Annual Reports.

28. Manucci, Niccolao, *Storia do Mogor*, 4 vols., Translated and Edited by William Irvine, 1907-8 (Indian Text Series.)

29. Mysore Archaeological Reports.

30. Nagam Aiya, V., *The Travancore State Manual*, 3 vols., 1906.

31. Nieuhoff, John, *Voyages and Travels into Brasil and the East Indies*, ii, 1703.

32. Nelson, J. H., *The Madura Country*, 1868.

33. Orme, Robert, *Historical Fragments of the Mogul Empire*, 1805.

34. Purchas, Samuel, *His Pilgrimes*, 20 vols.

35. Rangacharya, V., *Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency*, 3 vols. 1919.

36. Rev, Alexr., *Monumental Remains of the Dutch East India Company in the Presidency of Madras*, 1897.

37. Rice, L., *Mysore*, 2 vols.

38. Rosebery, *Napoleon, the Last Phase*.

39. Sarkar, Jadunath, *Shivaji and His Times*, 1919.

40. Sarkar, Jadunath, *History of Aurangzib*, 4 vols.

41. Sewell, Robert, *A Forgotten Empire* (Vijayanagar), 1900.

42. Sewell, Robert, *Lists of Antiquities, Madras*, 2 vols., 1882 and 1884 (Archaeological Survey of Southern India, Vols. I and II).

43. Smith, Dr. Vincent A., *Akbar the Great Mogul*, Oxford, 1917.

44. Srinivasa Raghavaiyangar, Dewan Bahadur S., *Memorandum on the Progress of The Madras Presidency During The Last Forty Years of British Administration*, 1893.

45. Stuart, A. J., *Manual of Tinnevelly*, 1879,

46. Takakhav, N. S. and Keluskar, K. A., *The Life of Shivaji*, 1921.

47. *Tanjore District Gazetteer*, i, 1915.

48. Taylor, The Rev. William, *Catalogue Raisonne*, 3 vols., 1857-62.

49. Taylor, The Rev. William, *Oriental Historical Manuscripts*, 2 vols., 1835.

50. Thevenot, *Travels*, 1687.

51. *Tiruppaṇimālai*, Sen Tamil Publication, No. 27, Madura.

52. Tracy, The Rev. J. E., *Pandyan Coins*.

53. *Travancore Archaeological Series*, 2 vols., 1910-3, 1916.

54. Turnour and Wijesimha's *Mahāvamśa*.

55. Wheeler, J. Talboys, *Madras in the Olden Time*, 3 vols., 1861-2.

56. Wilks, Marks, *History of Mysoor*, 2nd edition, 2 vols., 1869.

INDEX

References are to pages except where inscription Numbers (I. Nos.) are given.

A

Achchaiya, Mangammāḷ's minister, 166, 179.

Achyutappa Nāyaka of Tanjore, 74n, 92n; I. No. 78.

Achyuta Rāya, Vijayanagar emperor, 6, 9, 30, 37, 46, 48; his Travancore campaign and marriage with Pāṇḍya princess, 8, 28-9, 31, 38, 53; I. Nos. 14, 17-9, 255.

Achyutarāyābhyudayam, 29, 30.

Acton, Lord, on the study of history, 22.

Adil Shah (Sultan of Bijapur). See Bijapur.

Ādiyappa Nāyaka, protector of the Christians, 139-40.

Aiyapēndra, Dāmarla, 129; I. No. 194

Akanna, Hindu minister of Golkonda, 131.

Akbar, Moghul emperor, his advance into the Dakhan, 87n; Tirumala Nāyaka compared to, 108; his revenues, 189.

Aḷagiri Nāyaka, foster-brother of chokkanātha Nāyaka and his viceroy of Tanjore, 124-6, 126n, 127, 138, 142, 144, 211; I. No. 170.

Albuquerque, his relations with Krishṇadēva Rāya, 66n.

Alfred and the Burnt Cakes, 152.

Alvarez, Father, 105, 139.

Ammaiya—Nāyakkanūr, battle of, 176.

Annamuttammāḷ, 144n.

Anwaruddin, 177.

Arantāngi, its capture by Ramnad, 161, 170-71.

Araśumalai, general of Sambaji, 137-8, 217-9.

Archaeology, help to history, 27.

Arcot, Nawab of, his expedition to reduce Tanjore and Madura, 175.

Ariyanātha, Daḷavāy, 36: his campaigns in and settlement of Tinnevelly, 37-9; his administrative organization, 41-3, 45; his life and greatness, 44; his part in the battle of Talikota, 51; his alleged dominance, 51-2, 55, 56-7; his death and its consequences, 61; date of his death and his age, 61-2, 66, 179 and n, 195; I. Nos., 49, 66.

Army and Navy, 196.

Ativīrarāma Pāṇḍya, 46, 74-5, 77; I. Nos., 31, 47, 51, 58, 76, 90, 93.

Auramgam, capital of Ceylon, 50.

Aurangzib, Moghul emperor, 16-7, 133 and n: assertion of his imperial authority and his mission to Madura, 147-9, 149n; Mangammāḷ's relations with, 154-6.

Aurpaliam. See Uḍayārpāḷaiyam.

B

Baḍages, the, Xavier's complaints against, 10, 66n; 157-8, 226-7, 249.

Bahau-d-Din, cousin of Muhammad Tughlak, his rebellion followed by others, 2.

Baḷḷālas, 1-3.

Bālōji Puṇdit, Tanjore minister, 158-9, 242-3.

Bāṇa Country, chiefs of, 56-7n. See Vaṇādarāyars.

Baramahāls of Salem, included in the Channapaṭṭana viceroyalty, 14, 78n, 95n; 156.

Barradas, quoted or referred to, 26, 32, 73, 74, 78, 186-8.

Bednore, chiefs of, 98, 129, 146; Mysore conquest of, 156. See Ikkēri.

Bellarmine, cardinal, 79.

Bertholdi, Father, 214, 244.

Bertrand, Father J., editor of *La Mission du Maduré*, 24-25, 79, 85.
Besse, Father Léon quoted or referred to, 76*n*, 110, 189.
Bhāgavatam, 112*n*.
Bhagnagar (Hyderabad, Dakhan), 131.
Bhavāni Sankara Tēva, Sētupati, 170-2, 172*n*.
Bhōja Sri, 66*n*.
Bijapur, aggressive southern campaigns of, etc., 6, 9, 11, 13-19, 86 *n*, 87-8*n*, 95, 100, 113-4; intervention in Tanjore affairs, 125-7; in the battle of Erode, 129; 131, 134; Aurangzib's efforts, to reduce, 148; 200-1, 204-6, 208-9, 211-3.
Bōmbaḷḷi, 78*n*
Borghese, Father, 225.
Bouchet, Father, his labours for the progress of Christianity and his interview with Dalavāy Narasappaiya, 163-4, 233-40; 232; his letter of 1700, 325.
Britto, Father John de, his life and work, 150-152; left for Portugal, 151; his return to India, his last days, and martyrdom, 160-3, 235; his letter of 1683, 220.
Bryce, Viscount, on historical considerations in the choice of a capital, 83 *n*.
Bullal Cawn, 131.
Burgess and Natesa Sastri, *Tamil and Sanskrit Inscriptions*, 27.
Burnell Dr., 75, 77.
Bury, Prof., 181.

C

Caldwell, Bishop, his sweeping condemnation of Mackenzie records, 23; quoted or referred to, 29-30, 42-3, 67, 71, 77, 190, 197.
Canacan, Bijapur general, 97. See Kanakan.
Carnatic, the, British occupation of, 1; Sivaji's invasion of, 17, 18, 130-4 Nawabs of, 191, 244.
Carvalho, Father Simon, 239, 243.
Catalogue Raisonne of O. H. MSS., of Taylor, 23-4.
Central Government, 178-80; its character, 180-2; its organization, 282-3.
Ceylon, relations of the Cholas and Pāṇḍyas with, 3; Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala's invasion of, 10; Krisṇappa Nāyaka's invasion of, 49-51; embassy to Madura 173, 193; I. Nos, 13, 57.
Chāmaraja Uḍaiyār of Mysore, his annexation of the Channapaṭṭaṇa viceroyalty and extension of the Mysore frontier, his aggrandizement and nominal allegiance to Vijayanagar, 15-6, 85-6*n*, 89, 96*n*, 97*n*.
Chanda Sahib, his perfidy, 1; his dealings with Mīnākshi and usurpation, 175-7.
Chandler, the Rev. J.S., quoted, 69-70, 138-9.
Chandragiri, viceregal headquarters, 11; capital of Vijayanagar empire, 14, 16; abandoned, 87*n*, 88*n*.
Chandraśēkhara Pāṇḍya, 6, 35, 37.
Channapaṭṭana Viceroyalty, its extent, 78-9*n*; Mysore annexation of, 14-5, 86*n*, 88*n*, 95*n*, 96*n*.
Chengamala Dās, Tanjore Nāyak prince, his vicissitudes, 125-7, 125*n*, 128*n*, 138, 149.
Chevva, Chinna. See Śevvappa Nāyaka.
Chidambaram, 58.
Chikkadēvarājasāgara, 159*n*.
Chikkadēva Rāya of Mysore 15, 18, 98-9*n*, 121, 129*n*, 143*n*, 166-7, 168*n*; his aggressive policy, 128-30, 155, 156; his irrigation scheme, 159-60, 159*n*, 246; I. Nos., 176, 180-2, 186, 194, 202, 229.
Chikkadēvarāyavamśāvaḷi, 99*n*.
Child, Mr., 131.
Chinna Kattira Nāyaka of Kaṇṇivādi, 123, 136.
Chinnatambi Mudaliyār. See Sinnatambi Mudaliyār.
Chokkanātha Nāyaka, 28, 111; change of his capital, 99 *n*, 119-20; date of his accession, 115-6; early years of his reign, 116-9, 206-8; his relations with Mysore, 120-2, 128-30, 136-7, 216-7; his Tanjore wars, 118-9, 122-4, 208-9 211; his dealings with the Mahrattas, 124-8, 132, 133-5, 212, 214; his deposition and restoration, 135-6, 215; last years of his reign, 136-7, 214-5, 216-9; his relations with the Sētupati, 119-20, 137-9, 207, his attitude towards Christianity, 138-41; his character and administration, 141-3; his death, 143, 219; 156, 206-13, 214-5, 216-9; I. Nos., 156-8, 163-8, 177-9, 186.

Chola Country (*maṇḍalam*), Chieftains in the Pāṇḍya Country, 4, 11; separarated from Madura Viceroyalty, 37.

Cholas, their political greatness and relations with the Pāṇḍyas, 3-4, 6-7; their commercial enterprise and foreign policy, 66*n*.

Christianity, conversion of the Paravas to and its results, 1, 9-10, 66-67*n*, 91-2*n*, 238; De Nobili's scheme of conversion to, 68-70; Muttukrishṇappa's attitude to, 71; progress of, under Muttu Vīrappa I, 79-80; under Tirumala Nāyaka, 103-6; under Chokkanātha Nāyaka, 138-41; under Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka III, 150-1; its vicissitudes in the time of Mangammāḷ and her benevolent attitude to, 161-5, 233-40; in the Marava Country, 170-1, 205, 221, 225, 243-4 246-7.

Coins, of the Sultans of Madura, 7; of Sivaji on Vijayanagar model, 18, 99*n*, 133*n*; of Viśvanātha Nāyaka, exhibiting Pāṇḍya emblems, 46; of Muttukrishṇappa Nāyaka, 70; of the Nāyaks, 70-1.

Commerce and Industries, 191-2, 228, 230.

Costa, B. Da, 105, 140.

Cotate, town, 157, 226, 228.

D

Dalavāy and his functions, 178-80.

Daḷavāy Sētupati. See Saḍaika Tēva I and II.

Dannāyak (Dannaik), 4, 10 66*n*.

Danvers, F. C., quoted or referred to, 27, 91, 92 and *n*, 102.

Daud Khan, 155-6.

Deogir, Muhammadan province of, 2.

Dēvaraja Uḍaiyār of Mysore, 18, 98-99*n*, 121 and *n*, 128-9; I. Nos. 155, 161-2, 171-2, 174.

Dēvarāya II, Vijayanagar emperor, prominence of the Madura Viceroyalty under, 4, 10; difficulties of the empire after his death, 4-5; 56*n*.

Dēvikōṭṭa, 77*n*; dislodgment, of the Portuguese from, 92*n*.

Dias, Father, 241.

Doḍḍadēvarāja. See Dēvarāja of Mysore.

Doḍḍa Krishṇa Uḍaiyār. See Krishṇarāja Uḍaiyār of Mysore.

Dutch, the, alliance with Ramnad, 91, 92*n*; their struggle with the Portuguese, 102-3, 205, 249; their atrocities, 117; appealed to for help, 118, 254; their administration, 183-4, 250-1; their trade, 184-5, 229-31; 191, 196.

E

Education, 194.

Ekāmbara Mudaliyār, 53; I. No. 43.

Ekoji (Venkaji), brother of Sivaji, his Tanjore expedition, 125 and *n*, 211-2; his usurpation, 127-8, 128*n*, 212-3; his administration, 127-8, 130, 184, 212, 220; Sivaji's interview with, 132-3, 132-3*n*, 213; his war with Santaji, 134-5, 213-5; his relations with Chokkanātha Nāyaka, 136, 142, 217; his tyranny, 146-7, 215, 219, 220; his sale of Bangalore, 155.

Epigraphy, historical value of its testimony, 267; Madras Department of, reports, 27.

Erode, battle of, about 1672, Mysore success in, 18, 99*n*, 129; I, No. 194.

Eṭṭuvīṭṭil Piḷḷamār, eight Travancore ministers, 157, 226, 248.

F

Fergusson, 108.

Ferishta, 102 *n*.

Fernandez, Father G., his missionary work, 59-60, 68-9; his opposition to Nobili, 79.

Finance, 21, 184-91.

Fishing-Coast, 228-31. See Paravas.

Foreign evidence, its historical value, 25-6.

Fort St. George records, 26, 100.

Frederick, Cæsar, quoted or referred, to, 109, 120, 121, 126, 133, 136, 139, 140, 143, 150; his letter of 1666, 210-1; of 1676, 211-3; of 1678, 213-6; of 1682, 216-20.

G

Gajapatis of Kalinga. See Orissa.

Gangādēvi, wife of Kampaṇa, her epic poem, 3, 7.

Gingi, Nāyak of, hostile to the empire, 13, 16-7, 74; in the battle of Toppūr,

76*n*; 86, 94-5; Muhammadan seige and capture of, 96; 106, 116, 122-3*n*, 131; captured by Sivaji, 131-2; under Santaji, 134; Moghul siege of, 155; 199-200, 208, 209, 211, 212-5, 219-20.
Golkonda, invosions of, 11, 12-4, 16-8, 75*n*, 87-8*n* 95-6, 95 *n*, 100, 130-1; Aurangzib's reduction of, 148; 199-200, 220.
Gopinath Rao, 77.
Governors, 181-2.
Gōvinda Dīkshita, Tanjore minister, 92*n*.
Gōvindaiya, general, 176.
Gōvindappaiya, Daḷavāy, 136, 179, 217*n*.
Gregory XV, Pope,his Bull, 79.
Grose, J. H., quoted, 100.
Guerreo, his *Relation*, 76.

H

Hamir Rao, 133.
Hampaiya, Mysore Daḷavāy, 100; I. No. 146.
Hanafī, Muhammad Sharīff, quoted, 82.
'Harasura Nandi Rāja,' Mysore general, 88.
Harem, 136, 193.
Harihara I of Vijayanagar, 56*n*.
Harihara II, Vijayanagar, emperor, 4.
Hassan, battle of, 18, 99*n*, 129-30.
Henry II of England, Krishṇadēva Rāya compared to, 7.
'Hermécatti,' 42, 70, 74, 79, 222.
Hill, S.C., 176*n*.
Historical Study, its requirements and Lord Acton's dictum, 21-2.
History of the Carnataca Governers, its defective chronology, 21; its historical value, 23; quoted or referred to, 32, 43, 47, 68, 71, 81, 92, 101*n*, 102, 110, 112, 136*n*, 167, 174.
Holy Roman Empire, quoted, 83*n*.
Hough, J., 69.
Hoyśalas, the, their last great ruler, 1, 3; their capital, 2; their empire developed into the Vijayanagar empire, 3.
Hultzsch, Dr. 46, 70.

I

Idal Khan (Adil Shah). See Bijapur.
Ikkēri, 14; asylum to Śrīranga in, 18, 94-5*n*, 129; 132-3, 220. See Bednore Chiefs and Śevappa Nāyaka.
Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency, 115.
Irrigation, 190, 197.

J

Jaffna, Rāja of, 92*n*.
Jagadēva Rāyal. Channapaṭṭaṇa Viceroyalty of, 14, 78*n*, 97*n*.
Jagga Rāya, Gobbūri Chief, traitor, his massacre of the royal family, 13, 75*n*; his treason to the empire, 13, 72-4, 75-6*n*, 77*n*.
Jamal-ud-Din, Governor of Shiraz, 66*n*.
Jesuit letters, their historical value, 24-6
Jesuits, their missionary activities, 1-2, 67*n*.
Justice, 183.

K

Kaḍāram, rulers of, 66*n*.
Kafur, Malik, his occupation of Madura, 4
Kāḷaiyārkōvil, 56, 68, 119, 209.
Kalinga. See Orissa.
Kalkolang, 157*n*, 248.
Kaḷḷans (Thieves), 96, 113-4, 139, 200, 205, 206, 221, 232, 247.
Kambam Country, 32, 39.
Kampaṇa, Kumāra, his overthrow of Muhammadan rule in Madura, 3; first Vijayanagar Viceroy of Madura, 4; his administration, 7.
Kanakan, Bijapur general, 201.
Kaṇakkan (Accountant), 180.
Kaṇḍi, king of, 50. See Ceylon.
Kaṇṇambāḍi dam, 159-60*n*.
Kaṇṇanūr, Hoyśala capital, a Muhammadan Cantonmet, 2.
Kaṇnivāḍi, Polegar of, 78-9. See Ranganna Nāyaka and Chinna Kaṭṭīri Nāyaka.
Kanṭhīrava Narasa of Mysore, 16-7, 78-9*n*, 86*n*, 96*n*, 98, 98-9*n*; his war with Madura, 100-1, 101-2*n*; I. No. 146.
Kastūri Rangaiya, Daḷavāy, 168, 179.
Kastūri Rangappa, son of Vīrappa Nāyaka, 61; his usurpation and murder, 65, 196.
Kāṭṭaya Tēva, 172.
Kaveri, river, jungles cleared, 37; dam destroyed, 74; Mysore anicut across, 159, 159*n*, 243.
Kāyal, 66*n*.
Kaye, J.W., 69.
Kēśavappa Nāyaka, (1) Pedda, general, 36, 49. (2) Chinna, son of (1), 49.

Kiḷavan Sētupati (Raghunātha Tēva), 138, 149-50; attitute to Madura, 160-1; his policy towards Christians, 161-3; his administration and death, 169, 193, 223; I. Nos. 184-5, 188-9, 191, 213.

King and his Council of Ministers, 178-80; limitations on his absolutism, 180-2.

Kōdaṇḍarāma, nephew of Śri Ranga III, 18, 99*n*, 130.

Kongu Country, 15, 18, 98*n*.

'Korkulam,' 157 and *n*, 227.

Krishṇa, *river, termination of* Achyuta Rāya's march at, 8.

Krishṇadēva Rāya, Vijayanagar emperor, condition of the empire at his accession, 5; his vigorous internal and foreign policy, 5-6; his imperial reorganization, 6; disobedience of his viceroys, 6; his rage against Nāgama Nāyaka, 7, 51. Nāyakship of Viśvanātha commenced in his last years, 7, 30, 36; his sons-in-law, brothers and queens, 8-9; his campaign against Orissa and the Muhammadans, 31-2; 34; his Interference in the affairs of the South, 35; his death, 37; his relations with the Portuguese, 5, 66-7*n*. I No. 6

Krishṇappa Nāyaka I, 10, 29, 38, 44, 47; his internal troubles, 48-9; his invasion of Ceylon, 49-51; his attitude to the empire, 51-3; his benefactions, character and work, 52-3; his death, 53-54; 70*n*, 7*n*; I. Nos. 25, 32, 42-3, 53, 55-6-61, 63-4, 67.

Krishṇappa Nāyaka II, his short reign and death, 61-4; 65; I. Nos. 91-2, 94, 96-8

Krishṇappa Nāyaka of Gingi, 75*n*.

Krishṇāpuram, town, (1) built by Krishṇappa Nāyaka I, 52, 70*n*. (2) built by Muttukrishṇappa Nāyaka, 70.

Krishṇarāja Uḍaiyār of Mysore, 168*n*; I. Nos. 45, 221, 226, 238, 244-6.

Krishna Sastri, H., 28, 29, 75, 194.

Krishnaswami Aiyangar, S., his *Sources of Vijayanagar History*, 7, 27.

Kulasekhara, last great Pāṇḍya, 66*n*.

Kulōttunga III, last great Chola emperor, reduced the Pāṇḍyas to impotence and humiliation, 3; 56*n*.

Kumāraiya, Mysore Daḷavāy, 18, 130, 137, 156, 216-8; I. No. 176.

Kumāra Muttu, 'younger brother of Tirumala Nāyaka,' 71, 101, 175; probably his illegitimate son, 113.

Kumāra Muttu Tirumala, son of Tirumala Nāyaka, 71, 102; I. Nos. 151-2.

Kumāra Piḷḷai, Ramnad Daḷavāy, 138. his rebellion, 147; put to death, 149 50; his attitude to Christianity, 151.

Kūn Pāṇḍya, 59; I. No. 69.

Kūttan Sētupati, 68, 90; I. No. 122.

L

Lakkaṇa, Viceroy of Madura, eulogised by Abdur Razzak, 4; 10, 56*n*, 6-7*n*.

La Mission du Maduré, its historical value 24-6; translated extracts from, 198, 224.

Langlois and Seignobos, quoted, 21.

Lingama Nāyaka, Daḷavāy, 113, 116, 1S0, 144, 179, 206-8.

Linga Reḍḍi, 150-1.

Lists of Antiquities, of Sewell, 27.

Local Government, 182

Lockman, J., on Jesuit testimony, 25-6, his *Travels of the Jesuits*, extracts from; 225-247.

Louis XIV, 108.

Luiz, Fra., 66*n*.

M

Ma'bar province, Muhammad Tughlak's, constituted, 2; its isolation and struggle for existence, 2; subverted, 3.

Mackenzie, Col., 23.

Mackenzie MSS., their historical value, 23; quoted or referred to, 25, 68, 71, 89, 921, 110, 113, 136*n*, 144, 167, 186.

Mādana, Governor of the Tanjore Country, 4.

Madanna, Golkonda Hindu minister, 131.

Madhurāvijayam, epic poem of Gangādēvi, 3, 7.

Madura, town, Muhammadan (Malik Kafur's) occupation of, in 1310, 2, 3-4, 56*n*; capital removed from, 76; removed to, 83-4; again removed from, 119; Chanda Sahib's capture of, 176; André Freire's description of, 216.

Madura, Viceroyalty. importance of the history of, 1-2; retirement of the Pāṇḍyas from, 2, 4; its acquisition by the Hoyśalas and the foundation of the

Vijayanagar empire, 3; its foundation coeval with that of the Vijayangar empire, 4, 7; its first Viceroys, 4-5; its prominence under Dēvarāya II, 4; looseness of the imperial hold on, 5; Nāgama commissioned to organize, 6; discordant elements in, 8; reconstituted after Achyuta's Travancore campaign, 9-11; its extent under Viśvanātha. 39-40.

Maduraittalavaralāṟu, quoted or referred to, 24*n*, 32, 65, 81, 110, 112, 143, 153 174, 186, 288-97;

Mahrattas, in the South, 17, 19; their conquest and occupation of Tanjore, 124-8, 142; 177. See Ekoji, Sivaji Santaji, Sambaji, etc.

Majālisu-S-Salātīn, 82.

Mānabhūsha Pāṇḍva, defeated by Narasa Nāyaka, 5

Mānāmadurai, 4, 56, 119, 209.

Mangammāḷ, Queen-Regent, 109; time of her marriage with Chokkanātha discussed, 144-5; 153; her relations with the Moghuls, 154-6; with Mysore, 156; with Travancore, 156-8; with Tanjore, 158-60; with Ramnad, 160-1 Christianity under, 161-5; her administration, religious policy, charities, etc., 165-66; her death 166-7; 179; her social legislation, 193; 194-5, 224. I, Nos. 195, 197, 199-200, 205, 207, 209-12.

Mannār Dās, son of Vijayarāghava of Tanjore, 125*n*.

Manucci, quoted or referred to, 21, 26, 124*n*, 149, 155, 164-5.

Marava Country (Ramnad Country), its organization, 65-8, 70, 119; *interregnum* in, 138; its power developed by Kiḷavan Sētupati, 138; 149-50; Christianity in, 150-1, 161-3; condition after the death of Kiḷavan Sētupati, 169-73; partition of, 172; 223-4, 229, 230. 246-7. See Sētupatis.

Maravas, 91, 202, 209, 217, 219, 220-1, 250.

Martin, Father, quoted or referred to, 145, 160, 163, 164, 170-2, 128-9; 192; his letter of 1713, 223-4; his letters of 1700, 225-40; his letter of 1701, 240-6; of 1709, 246-7.

Martinz, Father, 103-4, 138; his letter of 1651, 223.

Mārttāṇḍavarman of Travancore, I. Nos. 10, 82.

Māvali Chieftains. See Vāṇādarāyars.

Māvali Vāṇādarāyar, his rebelion, 56 and *n*.

Maynard, Father, 226, 228.

Mello, Father, 163; his letter of 1686, 220-1

Mīnākshi, last Nāyak Queen, 1, 174; her short reign and tragic end, 175-7; I. Nos. 235-7.

Mir Jumla, 16.

Moghuls, the, 11, 16, 17, 18; their Dakhan policy, 87*n*; 154-6; their subjugation of Bijapur and Golkonda, 198.

Mṛtyunjaya M.S.S., their historical value, 24; quoted or referred to, 28, 32, 39, 47, 48, 51, 54, 60, 62-3, 65, 71, 81, 84, 110, 112, 115, 143, 145, 153, 167, 173.

Muhammadans, the, their invasion of South India in the 13th and 14th centuries, character and results, 1-4; their hostility to the Vijayanagar 5-6; 11, 12-4, 15, 17, 175-7. See Bijapur, Golkonda, and Moghuls.

Muhammad Tughlak, his empire, 2; its break-up, 2.

'Mukilan', Mysore general, 78.

Mula (Moula), Bijapur general, 113-4 206.

Mūrtimāmbāḷ, wife of Śevvappa Nāyaka and sister-in-law of Achyuta Rāya, 30.

Murugappa Pillai, 163.

Muttammāḷ, wife of Muttu Vīrappa III, 154, 224.

Muttu Aḷakādri, See Muttulinga Nāyaka.

Muttu Krishṇappa Nāyaka, son of Viśvappa, his accession, 65; his organisation of the Marava Country, 65-8; Christianity under, 68-70; his attitude to Vijayanagar empire, 70-1; his administration 70-1; his death and sons, 71, 77, 82; I. Nos. 95, 104.

Muttulinga Nāyaka, 135 and notes, 215-6; I. Nos. 183, 187.

Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka I, 13-4, 71; his attitude to the empire, 72-6, 80;

change of his cadital, 76, 76-7n; his relations with the Pāṇḍyas, 77-8; his relations with Mysore, 78; Christianity under, 79-80; survey o his administration, 80; his death 82; 81, 85-6, 86n, 89, 170n; I. Nos. 102-3, 108, 110-2, 114-20, 123-5.

Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka II, 111; his accession, 112; his short reign and death, 113, 203-4, 206.

Muttu Vīrappa Nāyaka III, 18, 109, his parentage and age, 144-6; condition of the kingdom at and after his accession, 145-7; his dealings with the Moghuls, 147-9; his relations with the Sētupati, 149-50; Christianity under, 150-1; his character and ability, 151-3; his death, 153; 157, 160, 166n, 219, 235, I. Nos. 190, 192, 196.

Mysore attitude to Vijayanagar empire, 13-5; independent, 15, 18; hostile to Madura, 17; aggressive, 18; survival to the present day, 18-9; invasion of Madura and its repulse, 75; aggression, 88-9; capital of, besieged, 89; war with Tirumala Nāyaka, 100-1, 101-2n, 201-30; Chokkanātha's war with, 120-1, 128-3, 130n, 135; siege of Trichinopoly, 136, 136-7, 146-7, 149n, 156, 169, 197, 199; help to Śrīranga III, 200, 201, 212, 216-22; civil war in, 221. see Rāja Uḍaiyār, Chāmarāja Uḍaiyār, Kaṇṭhīrava Narasa, Dēvarāja Uḍaiyār, and Chikkadēva Rāya.

N

Nāgama Nāyaka, officer of Sāḷuva Narasinga and Krishṇadēva Rāya commissioned to organise Madura, 6; his thorough-going administration and its consequences, 6, 28-30; his disobedience probably connected with Vīra Narasimha's rebellion, 8, 10, 27, 30, 32; his position under Krishṇadēva Rāya, 34; his pilgrimage to Benares, 34-5, his Southern expedition and its results, 35; his character and last days 35-6; I. Nos. 1-4, 14, 49, 51.

Nānjināḍ (part of Travancore), invasion of, 89, 157; I. Nos. 129, 204.

Napoleon, 22, 23.

Narasa Nāyaka, general of Sāḷuva Narasinga and father of Krishṇadēva Rāya, 5, 6, 66-7n.

Narasappaiya, Daḷavāy, his Travancore campaign, 158; his Tanjore campaign, 159, 241-2; his Ramnad campaign and death, 160; his attitude towards Christianity eulogised by Father Bouchet, 163-4, 165, 179, 195, 234-7.

Narasimha, Vīra, (1) Vijayanagar emperor, provincial revolts under, 5. (2) Viceroy of the Chola country, 6; his rebellion and flight to Travancore, 6, 8, 9, 30.

Narasinga, Sāḷuva, Vijayanagar emperor 5-6, 29, 34, 198n; I. Nos. 3-4.

Naravappaiya, minister, 173, 179.

Nayaks of Ikkēri. See Ikkēri.

Nāyaks of Madura, their history, range and character, 1, 20; connected with that of Vijayanagar, 2, 24; date of commencement of their rule, 7-10, 27-33; their charge extended in sphere and exalted in privilges, 10; their attempt at independence, 14-5, 199, 222; sources of their history, 23-7, extinction of their rule and its causes, 18-9, 176-7, 195-7; their administration, 178-84; their financial system, 184-91; social life under 191-4; their services and shortcomings, 194-7.

Nāyaks of Tanjore. See Tanjore and Śevvappa, Achyutappa, Raghunātha, Vijayarāghava Nāyakas.

Negapatam, Portuguese dislodged from, 92n; merchant of, 125 and n; protector and Daḷavāy of Chengamala Dās, 127.

Nelson, J. H., his history of the Nāyaks, of Madura, its character and merits, 20; quoted or referred to, 21-2, 23, 27, 28, 3 , 43, 47, 48, 51-2, 55-7, 61, 65-6, 71, 83-5, 88-9, 90, 92-3, 96, 109, 111, 112, 113, 115-6, 119, 122, 125n, 126, 128n, 134, 137, 144, 149, 157n, 158, 162, 166, 169, 174, 177, 179, 182-3, 184-7, 191.

Nieuhoff, John, quoted or referred to, 26, 33, 90, 118-9, 122, 159n, 179, 182-4, 193; extracts from his *Voyages and Travels*, 248-54.

Nobili Report De, his 'great experiment', 68-70: his missionary activities and death, 79-80, 103-4; 138; on Nāyak educational organisation, 194.

Noses, War of the, between Madura and Mysore, 100-2, 101-2*n*, 202-3.
Nuniz, Portuguese chronicler, 26, 30, 32,

O

Oriental Historical MSS., of Taylor, 23-4.
Orrissa (Kalinga) kingdom, its Gajapati rulers and Southern raids, 4-5; Krishṇadēva Rāya's campaign against, 6, 32, 35.
Orme, Robert, historian, quoted or referred to, 27, 100, 131.

P

Pāḷaiyam (Polegar) System, 38; its organisation, 41-4; 48-9, 56, 178; its decay, 196.
Palambang (Śri Bhōja), 66*n*.
Pallava Rāyan Toṇḍamān, 138.
Pāṇḍyan Chronicle, the, its historical value, 24; quoted or referred to 28, 32, 54-5, 64, 65, 71, 81, 110, 112, 115, 143 153, 167, 174.
Pāṇḍyas, (1) Ancient, their retirement from Madura and war of succession, 1, 3; Chola conquest of and extinction of their independence, 3; their political degradation under Kulōttunga III, 3-4 their efforts at independence and glorious imperial career, 3; their over-seas transactions and foreign policy, 4, 66*n*; their petty descendants, 6, 9. (2) Later, hostile to Vijayanagar empire, 5, 13, 37-8; feudatory to Madura, 46, 57, 63, 76*n*; their disappearance, 77-8; I. Nos. 15, 27-8, 31, 36, 38, 40-1, 44, 47, 54, 62, 83, 89, 96-7, 256.
Parākrama Bāhu, Ceylon ruler, his help to the Pāṇḍyas against the Cholas, defeated, 3.
Paramakuḍi, 49.
Parangis. See Portuguese.
Paravas, the, inhabitants of the Fishing-Coast, 1; their wholesale conversion to Christianity and its political results, 9, 59, 66-7*n*, 67, 91*n*; Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala commissioned to bring them back to Vijayanagar control, 10, 92*n*; 71, 102, 228, 230, 250, 251-3.
Paul, St., 69.
Peace and Order, how far preserved by the Nāyaks of Madura, 191-2.
Penukoṇḍa, capital of Vijayanagar empire changed to, 11, 58*n*, 73*n*; Muhammadan siege of, 11-2, 75*n*, 87-8*n*.
Polybius, historian, 124*n*.
Portuguese, the, commercial, religious, and political aspects of their policy in India, 1, 9-10, 65-8, 66-67*n*; their relations with Krishṇadēva Rāya, 5; in the battle of Toppūr, 13, 76*n*, 59 and *n*, 71; dislodged from Negapatam, 77*n*, 87*n*, help to Tirumala Nāyaka, 91, 91*n*; their wars with the Dutch, 102-3, 183-4, 191-2, 196, 205, 228, 248-51, their government of the Paravas, 252-53.
Pradhāni, his functions and status, 179; of Tanjore and Madura, 210
Proenza, Father, quoted or referred to; 73, 82, 85, 86, 91-2, 105-6, 109-11, 119 139-40, 179, 183; his letter of 1659, 198-205; of 1662, 205-8; of 1665, 208-10.
Provincial Government, 181-2.
Pudukotta, state, founded, 138; Rāja of, 171.
Purchas, *His Pilgrimes*, 26.
Puttalam, battle of, 49.

Q

Quilon, 157*n*.

R

Raghunātha, ruler of Pudukotta, 138.
Raghunāthābhyudayam. 74, 75-6*n*.
Raghunātha Mahārāja, 72; I. No. 120.
Raghunātha Nāyaka of Tanjore, his loyalty to the Vijayanagar empire, 12-3. 72*n*, 74, 75-6*n*. 77*n*, 92*n*.
Raghunātha Sētupati, (1) (Tirumalai Sētupati), his loyalty, power and prestige, 92-3; his devotion to Tirumala Nāyaka, 100-1, 107; his title of Tirumalai Sētupati, 101-2; Chokkanātha's war with 119, 209; his death, 173; I. Nos. 148, 153-4, 159, 169, 173, 175. (2) See Kiḷavan Sētupati.
Raghunāthpant, Sivaji's lieutenant, 130, 132-4.
Raichur, battle of, 30, 35; campaign of Krishṇadēva Rāya, 5, 32.

Rāja Uḍaiyar of Mysore, 12; his acquisition of Śrīrangapaṭṭanam, 12; 75-6*n*, 76*n*, 78, 78-79*n*, 86-7*n*.
Rājendra, the Gangaikoṇḍa Chola, put an end to Pāṇḍya independence, 3.
Rāma, son of Tirumala I and brother of Venkaṭa I, 11, 58*n*, 79*n*
Rāma (Vīra Rāmadēva), son and successor of Śrīranga (Chikkarāya) II, 13, 72, 73*n*, 75*n*. I. No. 120.
Rāmabhadra Nāyaka (probably Rāmappa Nāyaka), subordinate of Nāgama and Viśvanātha Nāyakas, 32, 34, 36, 39, 43-4.
Rāmachandra Nāyaka of Sendamangalam, 103.
Rāmaiya, 82; I. No. 121. See Rāmappaiya.
Rāmapa, 91. See *Ibid.*
Rāmappaiya, Dalavāy, his Mysore campaign, 89; his Ramnad campaign, 90-1; his death, 92-3; 106, 179, 195; I. Nos. 132, 140.
Rāmappaiyan Ammānai, ballad, 90; its historical value, 90; 91-2.
Rāmappa Nāyaka (probably Rāmabhadra Nāyaka), I. Nos. 13, 18, 20, 30, 39.
Rāmarāja of Talikota, 18, 95; I. No. 51.
Rāmarāja Aiyan, 31. See Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala.
Ramarajavījayamu, 18.
Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala, cousin of Rāmarāja of Tolikota, Viceroy of the South, his invasion of Travancore, Ceylon etc. and its results, 10, 28, 30, 45, 53, 66-7*n*, 87*n*, 89, 91*n*; I. Nos. 13, 16, 22, 26, 29, 33, 35, 37, 39.
Rāmarajīyamu, 99*n*.
Rāma Rāya Tummisi, 48; I. No. 12.
Rāma Varman, Bhūtalavīra, King of Travancore, 38; I. No. 26.
Rāmāyaṇa, the, 142*n*.
Rāmēśvaram, way to, unsafe and rendered safe, 68-9.
Ramnad, independent of Madura, 161; siege of, 172. See Marava Country, Sētupatis, etc.
Randhula Khan, Bijapur general, 15.
Ranga, father of Sadāśiva Rāya, 9.
Rangachari, V., his history of the Nāyaks of Madura, its merits and defects, 21-2; R. Sewell's opinion on, 22*n*; quoted or referred to, 28-9, 33, 40, 45, 47-8, 51-2, 54-7, 61-3, 65, 68, 70-3, 78, 83-4, 85-6, 88-9, 90, 94, 101*n*, 108-10, 115, 120, 121*n*, 124-5*n*, 128*n*, 144, 145*n*, 149, 152, 167*n*, 169, 172*n*, 174, 177 and *n*, 179*n*, 185, 187.
Ranga Krishṇa Muttu Vīrappa. See Muttu Vīrappa III.
Rangaṇṇa Nāyaka of Kaṇṇivāḍi, 89, 91 101, 113.
Rāvaṇaiya, general, 176.
Ravivarma, King of Travancore, 157 and *n*.
Ravivarman Kulaśēkhara, King of Travancore, 4.
Rāyasam, 180.
Razzak, Abdur, Muhammadan traveller, 4.
Rea, A., 91.
Religious Life, 192-3.
Rosebery, quoted, 23.
Rukmaṇīpariṇayam, its historical value, 24.
Ruskin, 195.
Rustam Khan, his usurpation and tyranny, 135-6, 136*n*, 138, 149, 192, 216.

S

Saa, Father Bernard, 163, 231.
Sadaika Tēva I (Daḷavāy Sētupati), 68; I. Nos. 105-6, 109.
Saḍaika Tēva II (Daḷavāy Sētupati), his war with Tirumala Nāyaka, defeated and imprisoned, 90-1; restored, murdered, 92.
Sadaśiva Rāya, Vijayanagar emperor, 9, 10-1, 51; his 'looting' of Ceylon, 50; his Krishnāpuram Plates, 28, 31, 38, 44, 51, 53. I. No. 61; I. Nos. 13, 16, 22-3, 25, 29, 32-5, 50-1, 55-7, 63, 65, 67.
Safdar Ali, 175.
Sagar, Bahau-d-Din's rebellion at, 2.
'Sagosi', Bijapur general, 113, *116*, 205, 207-8.
Sāhityaratnākaram, its historical value, 24, 59*n*, 74, 75*n*.
Śaka date, usually preferred to the cyclic year on inadequate grounds, 47, 82.
Sakkarepaṭṭaṇa, battle of, 18, 129.
Salakarāju Timmarāzu (Salakam Tirumala). See Timmarāzu Salakarāju.
Sālapaṭṭi Nāyaka of Salem, 103.

Sambaji, son of Sivaji, 137, 146-7; executed by Aurangzib, 148; 217, 219-21.

Samba]]i, 78-9*n*, 129; I. No. 194.

Santaji, brother of Sivaji, 132; made governor of Gingi, 133; his war with Ekoji, 134-5; his dealings with Chokkānatha, 135; 213-5.

Sati, 154 and *n*, 193, 203, 224.

Satyamangalam, Mysore invasion of, and its repulse, 100-2, 201-3; Mysore occupation of, 130; free from war and famine, 139; Nāyak of, his death and its consequences, 223.

Sētupatis, 65-8, 90-3, 119, 138, 150-1, 160, 169-73; I. Nos. 220, 223; 239-40, 242, 250, 260, See Marava Country.

Śevvappa Nāyaka, Viceroy of Tanjore, 9, 30, 37, 122.

Sewell, R, 22*n*, 27, 28, 82, 115, 145,

Shah Jahan, Moghul emperor, Śrīranga III's appeal to, 16; his efforts in the Dakhan, 94*n*.

Shahji, father of Sivaji, his conquests and *jaghir*, 16, 88*n*, 131, 132 and *n*, 134.

Shahji, of Tanjore, 150; his submission to the Great Moghul, 155; his war and alliance with Mangammāḷ, 158-9, 160; I. No. 193.

Singhaladvīpa Catha, its historical value, 24; its account of Krishṇappa Nāyaka I's invasion of Ceylon, 49-50.

Śinna (Chinna) tambi Mudaliyār, 123, 140.

Sivaganga, Raja of, 172-3, 176.

Sivaji, his invasion of the Carnatic, 17, 130-3, 213; his return home, 134; object of his expedition, probably to revive the Vijyanagar empire, 18, 99*n*, 132-3*n*; his grant to Śriranga III's sons, 130, 132-3*n*,

Śivappa Nāyaka of Ikkēri, 16; his usurpation, advance on Mysore, and defeat, 18, 129-30; his help to Śriranga III, 18, 94-5*n*, 98-9*n*.

Śivatatvaratnākaram, 98-9*n*.

Smith, Dr. V.A., 108, 189.

Social Life and Institutions, 191-4.

Śokkalinga. See Chokkanātha Nāyaka.

Soḷaga Chieftain, 76-7*n*.

Sources of Madura (Nāyak) History, 23-7.

Sources of Vijayanagar History, 7, 27.

South India, history of, synonymous with that of the Nāyaks of Madura, 1, 194; the Dakhan Sultanates ceased to be a power in the politics of, 17; character of the history of, after the cessation of the Vijayanagar empire, 18; light thrown on the history of, by the Jesuit letters, 24-5; political condition of, about the middle of Tirumala Nāyaka's reign, 94-5*n*; character of the politics of, 95.

Srinivasa Raghavaiyangar, Dewan Bahadur, 189

Srīranga I, Vijayanagar emperor, son of Tirumala I, his imprisonment, release and death, 11-2, 57, 58 and *n*, 76*n*, 86*n*. I. Nos. 70, 72, 75.

Śrīranga II (Chikkarāya), Vijayanagar emperor, nephew of Venkaṭa I, murdered, 13, 75*n*,

Śrīranga III, last Vijayanagar emperor, his imperial efforts, 14-5, 88*n*; condition of the empire at his accession, 16; his appeal to Shah Jahan, 16; his war with Tirumala Nāyaka and vicissitudes, 17-8, 94-100; and notes, 200-1; his last days and death, 18-9, 129-30; 128, 129*n*; I. Nos. 147, 155, 157, 160, 165-6, 168.

Śrīrangam, island, Achyuta Rāya's march as far as, 8; temple repaired, 37; Father Martin's description of, 239-40.

Śrīrangapaṭṭaṇam Viceroyalty, 11-2, 58*n*, 73*n*, 75*n*, 78-9*n*, 86*n*.

Sthānāpati, 180.

Stuart, A.J., on the Pālaiyam System, 43; on Nāyak land assessment, 191; on the services of the Madura Nāyaks, 197.

Sundara Pāṇdya, 77.

Supplementary MSS,, referred to 32, 81, 110, 112, 167, 174.

Sūrya, Rāja, Marava ruler, 138.

T

Taḍiya Tēva, Marava prince, 161-2.

Talavarāyan, Tanjore Vassal, 204.

Talikota, epoch-making battle of, results of, on the Vijayanagar empire, 11. 41, 73-4*n*, 33; Ariyanātha's part in, 52; change of capital after, 11, 58*n*, 73*n*; aggressive missionary activity after, 66-7*n*; 48, 87*n*; 'Tambi', illegitimate brother of Śadaika Tēva II, 90; his death, 93.

Tamil and Sanskrit Inscriptions, 27.
Tanakka Tēva, 93.
Tānda Tēva, 171.
Tanjāvūri Āndhra Rājula Charitra, its historical value, 24, 31, 35, 126*n*.
Tanjāvūri Vāri Charitra, 24, 126*n*.
Tanjore, 4; rearrangement of the territory of, and appointment of Śevvappa Nāyaka, as viceroy of, 9, 30, 37; loyalty to the empire, power and prestige after the battle of Toppūr, 73*n*, 75-6*n*, 76-7*n*; Tirumala Nāyaka's alliance with, 94; Muhammadan attack on, 113-4; Madura war with, 74, 118, 122-4, 158-60; Mahratta conquest and occupation of, 124-7; defeated by Ramnad, 160-1; intervention in Ramnad affairs, 171-2; 199-201, 203-6, 208, 209, 212, 215, 219, 223, 242-3, 245, 254. See Nayaks of Tanjore, Ekoji, Shahji of Tanjore.
Taylor, the Rev. W., 22: his *Oriental Historical MSS.*, etc., their historical value, 23; quoted or referred to 29, 39, 51, 55, 61, 62, 96, 149, 164, 186.
Teppakuḷam, dug by Visvanatha Nāyaka, 37.
Thebes, ancient monuments of, 108, 203.
Thevenot, quoted or referred to, 26, 95, 100.
Timma, brother of Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala, 10, 66-7*n*, 91-2*n*.
Timmarāzu, Salakarāju, brother-in-law of Achyuta Raya, his Travancore expedition, 8, 30.
Tinnevelly Country, troubles in and settlement of, 37-9.
Tirumala I, Vijayanagar emperor, 11; his administrative arrangement, merits and defects of, 11, 58*n*, 73-4*n*.
Tirumala, grandson of Tirumala I and nephew of Venkata I, his hostility to the empire, 12, 58*n*, 73-4*n*, 75*n*.
Tirumala Aiyangar, Mysore minister, 73-4*n*.
Tirumala, Bangāru, 174-5.
Tirumala, Salakam. See Timmarāzu, Salakarāju.
Tirumalāmbā, wife of Achyuta Rāya, 37.
Tirumala Nāyaka, 16-7. 21, 24-5, 28, 40, 71, 73, 76; date of his accession, 81-3; change of capital to Madura, 83-5; early years of his reign, 85-7; his first war with Mysore, 88-9; his invasion of Travancore and results, 89-90, his relations with the Sētupatis, 90-3, 156; his relations with the Vijayanagar emperor and Bijapur and Golkonda, 15, 86-7*n*, 87-8*n*, 93-110, 94-5*n*, 97-8*n*, 199-205; his final war with Mysore, 100-2, 201-3; his relations with the Portuguese and Dutch, 102-3; Christianity under 103-6; his character and greatness, 106-9, 203; his death, etc., 109-11; 122, 122-3*n*, 139, 168, 170*n*, 179, 180; his revenues. 186-9; 191, 193 195, 197, 206-7, 216, I. Nos. 128-39, 141-5, 147, 151-2.
Tirumalai Sētupati, See Reghunātha Sētupathi (1).
Tiruppaṇimālai, 24*n*, 58.
Tiruvāḍi, Sivaji's halt at, 132.
Tiruvaḍi (King of Travancore), defeated, 31; made tributary, 38; 57, 64, 89. I. No. 97.
Tiruvadi country (Tiruvaḍirājya). See Travancore.
Tiruvaluvatēvan, 171.
Tiruvaṇṇāmalai, Vīra Baḷḷāla III's strong position at, 2.
Toppūr, battle of, 13, 59*n*, 72*n*, 76*n*, 77*n*, 78-9*n*, 92*n*.
Travancore, Vīra Narasimha's flight to, 6, 8; Achyuta Rāya's expedition to, 8; reconstitution of viceroyalties after, 9; Ramarāja Viṭṭhala's invasion of, 10, 11, 13; subordinate to Madura 53, 66-7*n*, 76*n*, 78, 86-7*n*; Tirumala Nāyaka's invasion of, 89-90; Mangammaḷ's war with, 156-8; 169, 226-7, 248; I. Nos. 129, 204, See Tiruvadi.
Travancore Archaeological Series, 27.
Trichinopoly, death of Vīra Ballala and suicide of Mīnakshi in, 1; a missionary centre, 2; saved from Mysore, 17; included in Madura Viceroyality, 37; improved and strengthened, 37; capital changed to, 76, 76-7*n*, 119-20; removed from 83; Bijapur siege of 114, 116, 203, 208; Mysore (Kumāraiya's) siege of, 137, 156, 217, Mahratta (Araśumalai's) siege of, 137, 219; Chanda Sahib's Capture of, 18-9, 176.

Tumbichchi Nayaka, his rebellion and execution, 48-9; 52; I. No. 255.
Turnour and Wijesimha's *Mahāvamśa*, 50.
Tuticorin, town, Travancore authority in, 9; 102; captured by the Dutch, 102-3, 249; 229, 231, 248-9.

U

Udaiyārpāḷaiyam (Aurpaliam), Raja of, 155, 164.
Udayagiri, captured by the Gajapathi, 5.
Uddandar, agent of Viśvanātha Nāyaka, 46, I. No. 34.
Umayamma Rāṇi, queen of Travancore, 155*n*.
Uṇṇi Kēraḷavarma, King of Travancore, hostile to Madura, his edict to the people of Nānjināḍ, 89.
Uraiyūr, Mahārājās of, 72 and *n*.
Uraiyūr (Ramnad), battle of, 172.
Uyyakkoṇḍan Channel, 166; I. Nos. 195, 211.

V

Vaḍuganātha Tēva, 163, 170.
Vālikoṇḍapuram, battle of, between Ekoji and Santaji, 134.
Vallabha, Śri and Varatunga Pāṇḍya, Pudukottai Plates of, 12, 59, 75, 77; I. No. 76.
Vallam (kōṭṭai), included in Tanjore, 37; Bijapur capture of, 113, 204, 205; chokkanātha's conquest of, 118, 123, 209.
Vallamprākāra (Vallam), battle of, 12, 73*n*, 74, 76*n*.
Vāṇādarāyars, Māvali, Chola Chieftains in the Pāṇḍya country, 4, 8, 56 and *n*; I. Nos. 5, 7-9, 11, 97, 103.
'Vanamian', Bijapur general, 118, 208.
Vasco da Gama, 66-7*n*.
Vellore, 14; Muhammadan siege of, 16, 88*n*, 94-5*n*; Sivappa Nāyaka's siege of, 98-9*n*, Sivaji's march to, 132-3*n*; Mahratta siege and fall of, 133, 134-5 and notes, 214.
Venkaji. See Ekoji.
Venkaṇṇa, Rāyasam, king-maker, his *coup d' état*, 124-6; his end, 127.
Venkaṭa (1) Achyuta Rāya's son, his deposition and death, 9. (2) brother of Śivappa Nāyaka of Ikkēri, 98-9*n*.
Venkaṭa I (Venkaṭapati Rāya), Vijayanagar emperor, 11-2; his difficulties, 12, 73-4*n*, 75*n*, 76-7*n*; his control over Madura, 58 and *n*, 70; his other feudatories, 63, 72; condition of the empire after his death, 12-14, 75-6 and notes, 76-7*n*, 80; 86-7*n*; his Daḷavāy Agraharam Plates, 27, 56, 57-9; I. No. 80; his Veḷḷanguḍi Plates, 31, 55-6, 63, I No. 96; I. Nos. 81, 84-6, 94-5, 97, 99-101, 111, 117.
Venkaṭa II, Vijayanagar emperor, 14, 16, 87, and n, 94, 97*n*, 199; his Kūniyūr Plates, 27, 34, 55, 65, 71, 82, 90, 93-4, 106, I. No. 128; I. No. 127.
Venkaṭāchārya, Dalavāy, 175.
Venkaṭadēva Mahārāja, 72, I. No. 119.
Venkaṭakrishṇaiya, Pradhāni, 168; I. No. 218.
Venkatakrishṇappa Nāyaka, Dalavāy, his Tanjore campaign, 122-3; 138, 149, 179.
Venkaṭapati Rāya. See Venkaṭa I
Venkaṭa Perumāl Nāyaka, 175.
Venkaṭarāghavāchārya, minister, *n*173, 179.
Vico, Father A., quoted or referred to, 42, 73, 79, 80, 82, 103; his death, 104; 186-7; his letter of 1611, 222.
Vijaya Gōpala Nāyaka, 50.
Vijayakumāra adopted son of Mīnākshi, 175-7.
Vījayanagar empire, bulwark of South India against Mahammadan advance, 1; salient features of its history necessary for the study of the history of the Nāyaks of Madura, 2, 24; its foundation, 1, 3-4; its extension to the sea, 4; its difficulties after the death of Dēvarāya II, 5-6; general revolt of the provinces and need for reconstruction, 5; government by regency in, 6; allegiance of the Paravas to Portugal necessitated imperial inte-vention, ; results of the battle of Talikota on, and transference of its capital to Penukonda, 11; its unity jeopardised by the administrative arrangement of Tirumala I, 11, symptoms of its disruption, 12; first act of its dismemberment, 13; civil war in, 13; disloyalty of its feudatories, 14; its

condition under Śrīranga III, 14-5; primary cause of its extinction, 15; intended renovation by Sivaji and its cessation, 18, 99*n*, 132-3*n*; Ceylon under, 50; attitude of Krishṇappa Nāyaka I to, 51-2; composed of three administrative charges, 58*n*; its control over the coast regions, 66-7*n*; attitude of Muttu Vīrappa I to, and civil war in, 72-76 and notes, 80; Tirumala Nāyaka's attitude to, see Tirumala Nāyaka; reduced to the kingdom of Vellore, 98; disappearance of, 130, See *Śrīranga* III.

Vijayarāghava Nāyaka of Tanjore, 76*n*, 96, 117-8, 122-4, 122-3*n*; his last days and death, 124, 125*n*; his treasures, 126, 142, 173.

Vijayaraghunātha Sētupati. 170-1, 172*n*.

Vijayaranga Chokkanātha, 154, 167 and *n*; his character and administration, 168-9, 173; his death, 174; 179-80, 193, 196; I. Nos. 198, 201, 203, 214-8, 224-5, 227-8, 230-4.

Vīra Baḷḷāla III, last great Hoysala emperor, his struggle for Hindu independence, 1; his attack on Ma'bar and death, 3; his work continued by his officers, 3.

Vīrabhadra Nāyaka, brother of Śivappa Nāyaka of Ikkēri, 98-9*n*.

Vīrappa Nāyaka, 12, 27, 54; not a joint ruler, 55; not a *roi fainéant*, 56-7; his attitude to Vijayanagar, 57-8; his work of peace, 58-9; Christianity under, 59-60; his death, 60; his sons, 61, 68, 73*n*; I. Nos. 46, 68-9, 71, 73-4, 76-7, 80; 84, 87-8, 261.

Vīraśēkhara chola; 6, 35.

Vīra Vasantha Rāya, 50.

Vissarāya. See Vijayaraghava Nāyaka of Tanjore.

Viśvanātha Nāyaka, his war against his father, 7; his appointment and position as Viceroy of Madura, 7-8, 10; founder of Nāyak rule, 21, 27; date of his Viceroyalty, 27-33; his birth and early life, 34, 47; his southern expedition and results, 36; his work in the South, 36-9; the extent and nature of his authority 38-9; his administrative organization, 41-4; his officers, 44; his character and achievements, 45-6; his age and death, 46-7; 48-9, 56, 65-6, 66-7*n*, 77, 109, 179*n*, 195; I. Nos. 14, 21, 23, 30, 33-4, 37, 47-51, 56, 96-7.

Viśvappa, son of Vīrappa Nāyaka, 61, 65.

Viṭṭhala, Rāmarāja. See Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala.

W

Wheeler, T., 21, 121*n*, 124*n*, 144.

Wilks, quoted or referred to, 29, 98, 120-1, 121*n*, 129, 134*n*, 167, 174, 186, 196.

X

Xavier, St. Francis, 9-10, 66-7*n*. 67, 91*n*, 228.

Y

Yāchama Nāyaka, his loyalty to the Vijayanagar empire, 13, 74, 75-6*n*, 76-7*n*.

Yagñanārāyaṇa Dīkshita, 59*n*.

Z

Zamorin of Calicut, 66-7*n*.

Zulfikar Khan, 154.